

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 593, Vol. 23.

March 9, 1867.

PRICE 6d.
Stamped 7d.

THE MINISTRY.

THE personal explanations of last Tuesday gave occasion to the liveliest debate of the present Session. On the previous day, Mr. DISRAELI, while he professed to say nothing, had said too much in his declaration that the Cabinet had now reverted to its original plan; and Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. OSBORNE were not backward in suggesting the inference that the retiring Ministers must have withdrawn their assent from some project to which they had previously agreed. The ignorance which prevailed in the House of Commons was merely conventional, as the whole course of events had been already related in the House of Lords by Lord DERBY and Lord CARNARVON. Mr. DISRAELI's explanation on Tuesday threw little additional light on the transaction; but General PEEL and Lord CRANBORNE supplied all material deficiencies in the story. Lord DERBY and Mr. DISRAELI had early agreed on the principle of the measure which is to be introduced on the 18th of March, but, foreseeing the probable dissent of some of their colleagues, they had in their pockets a second string for their bow. It was not until the 16th of February, eleven days after the meeting of Parliament, that Lord CRANBORNE heard of Bill No. 1; and it might be supposed that he never heard of Bill No. 2, which was founded on a 6l. rating franchise, until its details were stated to the House on the 25th. Mr. DISRAELI, however, says that Bill No. 2 was sanctioned by a united Cabinet; while Lord CARNARVON declares that it was equally disapproved by the majority and the minority. On the 23rd, Lord DERBY had announced to a meeting of his party his own preference for Bill No. 1; but on the morning of the 25th, Lord CRANBORNE and Lord CARNARVON, after studying the statistics of the question, were unable to concur in the opinion of the PRIME MINISTER, and tendered their resignations. In the hope of retaining their services, Mr. DISRAELI produced the alternative measure; but when it became evident that a 6l. rating franchise would not be favourably regarded by the House or the country, the Cabinet, which had already arrived at a similar conclusion, reverted to Bill No. 1, at the cost of losing the dissentient Ministers. In a vain attempt to give historical unity to a series of blunders and contradictions, Mr. DISRAELI offered Mr. GLADSTONE an opportunity of taunting him both with inaccuracy and with want of generosity. It was a mistake to say that the Liberal party had opposed Bill No. 2, either in the House or at their separate meeting. On the contrary, both Mr. GLADSTONE and his followers had been studiously candid and unalterably moderate; nor was there just cause for suspecting that any Ministerial Bill would be defeated on the second reading. It is true that political generosity may generally be explained by considerations of prudence; but if Mr. DISRAELI may be excused for not feeling deeply grateful to Mr. GLADSTONE, he was not entitled to refer to his motives when his acts had been wholly unobjectionable. The honours of the debate which followed the explanations belonged to Mr. BRIGHT. The cheerfulness which is naturally produced by conscious triumph is favourable to Parliamentary success. A year ago Mr. GLADSTONE was exposed to constant attacks because his acceptance of Mr. BRIGHT's support was regarded as the result of a compact; but it is now necessary for Mr. BRIGHT himself formally to disclaim the political connexion with Mr. DISRAELI which might have been imagined by suspicious minds as an explanation of the policy of the Government.

The secession from the Cabinet of three of its most considerable members is ill-timed and untoward, although it appears to have been unavoidable. General PEEL was the only original dissentient from a large measure which in some unexplained manner includes household suffrage; and yet the Cabinet was not even approximately united when, at the

beginning of the Session, Mr. DISRAELI condescended to the task of talking against time. When the first surprise and irritation subsided, it was universally and correctly understood that his absurd speech, if not his Resolutions, had been concocted for the purpose of giving him a further opportunity of inducing his colleagues to agree on a Bill. But his hopes were entirely disappointed, for two Ministers subsequently joined the minority, and Mr. DISRAELI resorted to the wonderful plan of expounding to the House of Commons a Bill which was not approved either by himself or by either section of the Government. Official reticence and party loyalty have perhaps prevented a full disclosure which at the best could but satisfy an idle curiosity. Charges and re-criminations among those who were recently colleagues would have been useless and undignified, nor is it possible for any of the parties to the transaction to acquit themselves wholly of an error of judgment. Neither the remaining nor the outgoing members were justified in consenting to the Reform paragraph in the QUEEN'S Speech, unless all the Cabinet either knew its exact meaning, or reposed perfect confidence in the Minister who was charged with the conduct of the measure. Lord DERBY says that, of his two measures, the less extensive project was chosen in the hope of preventing a Ministerial rupture; but the result proved that there had never been either agreement or a chance of agreement. All the members of the Cabinet had concurred in the determination to introduce a Reform Bill, but they had neglected to ascertain in proper time whether their respective opinions could be reconciled. The provisional evasion of the difficulty by the adoption of vague Resolutions was probably Mr. DISRAELI's device, but all his colleagues were as responsible as himself for the adjournment of a decision. On the other hand, Lord DERBY and Mr. DISRAELI must share the blame which attaches to the postponement till March of resignations which, but for a misunderstanding, would have been tendered in January. The alleged hope of eliciting from the House of Commons an expression of opinion furnishes no adequate excuse.

The censure or acquittal of individual statesmen principally concerns themselves. There can be no imputation on the honour of the seceders, who have made a painful sacrifice in separating themselves from the leaders of their party; but the loss to the Government in administrative efficiency and Parliamentary strength is great and undisputed. Two of the outgoing Ministers were probably fitter for their respective posts than any other members of the House of Commons; and Lord CARNARVON was rapidly acquiring the confidence of the colonies and the country. Lord CRANBORNE had mastered with surprising rapidity the details of Indian business, and he combined unwearied industry and sound judgment with remarkable boldness and vigour. The House of Commons approved both his recent decision on the claims of the Rajah of MYSORE and the grounds on which it was adopted; yet Lord CRANBORNE had overruled the policy of his predecessor at the India Office, and of several successive Viceroys. All classes, civil and military, who are connected with India were learning to rely on the justice and firmness of the SECRETARY OF STATE, and it is a serious misfortune that a useful career should be interrupted by a difference of political opinion on a question which is virtually settled. Even if Lord CRANBORNE had yielded to irresistible necessity, no assailant would have suspected him of an interested sacrifice of his convictions. General PEEL also was esteemed and trusted by the army, and he has always been one of the most popular members of the House of Commons. His scepticism as to the advantages of Reform would have been readily condoned if he had acquiesced, like Mr. LOWE, in the conclusions of a majority of all parties. The Duke of WELLINGTON is said to have converted

many unwilling peers to Corn-law repeal by the argument that they could not object to the measure more than the Duke himself, but that nevertheless he was about to support the Bill in his capacity of a Cabinet Minister; and General PEEL, although his position is not equally exceptional, might have imitated the Duke's example, without fear of misconception. The best claim of Lord DERBY's Cabinet to support was derived from the competence of its principal members for their posts; but the Government has now lost three able Secretaries of State, and those who have succeeded them will perhaps scarcely supply their places. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE may perhaps become a good Indian Minister, but he was in his proper place as President of the Board of Trade, and financial adviser of Mr. DISRAELI. The Duke of RICHMOND is an able and practical man of business, and his popularity and influence will add strength to the Government. As the office of Vice-President of the Board of Trade is about to be abolished, Mr. CAVE's services will probably be transferred to some other department. The Duke of BUCKINGHAM is unknown as a statesman, but he may probably have been competent to discharge the easy duties of the Presidency of the Council since the subsidence of the cattle plague. The Duke of MARLBOROUGH is a respectable nobleman, with strong ecclesiastical propensities, which will not facilitate the settlement of educational disputes. Sir JOHN PAKINGTON is industrious and confident in himself, and he had acquired considerable knowledge of the navy; but by the time that he has become equally familiar with military matters, a change of Government will probably render his new attainments comparatively useless to the public service. Mr. CORRY is as well acquainted with naval affairs as any civilian in the House of Commons; but, on the whole, the loss which the Government has suffered has received no adequate compensation. Mr. DISRAELI and Lord STANLEY are now the only Ministers belonging to the first rank in the House of Commons, while, in the less important region of the Lords, the Duke of MARLBOROUGH is a feeble substitute for Lord CARNARVON.

The injury to the Government is not confined to the loss of three considerable Ministers. Lord CRANBORNE and General PEEL represent the opinions of a large section of the party which has been accustomed to make good the deficiency of its numbers by the strictness of its discipline. Mr. DISRAELI has probably lost the hearty support of a third part of the House of Commons; and consequently he must rely in the conduct of his measure of Reform almost wholly on the indulgence of his political opponents, if not on the dangerous patronage of Mr. BRIGHT. The relative position of parties is too paradoxical to be explained by the personal moderation of which Mr. GLADSTONE has furnished a conspicuous example. The Government has not only changed its front, but altered its plan of campaign, and partially disbanded its forces, in the presence of an enemy; and yet no indication of weakness has provoked a hostile attack. Mr. GLADSTONE is capable of self-denial for a public object, but he might justifiably think that Reform ought to be carried by Reformers, and that the Ministers should represent the undisputed majority of the House of Commons. His unwillingness to commence an active opposition proves that he is not yet able to rely on the unanimous support of his own ostensible followers. The Cave of Adullam is still open, though it may be temporarily abandoned by its occupants; nor is it certain that the division between the moderate and extreme sections of the Liberals would not extend further than during the last Session into the mass of the party. The late meeting of the party was perfectly harmonious as long as there was only a question of censuring the indefensible tactics of the Government; but Lord GROSVEOR, speaking in the name of the waverers, carefully abstained from giving any pledge to support a strong measure of Reform. Mr. GLADSTONE probably understands that uncertain allegiance to a party is more likely to be confirmed by opposition than when the leaders are in office. If, however, circumstances relieve him from the risk of mutiny or secession, his toleration of Mr. DISRAELI's vagaries will soon be exhausted. The failure of the Reform Bill on which the Government may finally determine would render a change of Ministry inevitable. If the Bill passes, it must necessarily be followed by a dissolution within the year, and it is at present impossible to calculate on the opinions or character of the future House of Commons. The disorganization which prevails can only be corrected by a reconstruction of party alliances. Between the Conservatives who are about to support Mr. DISRAELI, and the moderate Liberals or Whigs, there is no longer any intelligible difference of opinion; and after every considerable change in the Constitution, the party of resistance receives many new adherents, who are alarmed at the possible

consequences of the concessions to which they have been persuaded to assent. Within nine years from the passing of the Reform Bill, Sir ROBERT PEEL commanded an overwhelming majority in the House of Commons; nor would his power have been broken during his lifetime if his followers had been wise enough to concur in his adoption of a free-trade policy. The Conservative party, in the form in which it has long been led by Lord DERBY and Mr. DISRAELI, will perhaps have been irretrievably shattered by the secession of Lord CRANBORNE and his colleagues.

IRELAND.

THE Fenian outbreak shows the difficulty of discovering the secrets of conspirators who happen not to have been betrayed by an accomplice. There is no reason to suspect that the Irish Government or the heads of the constabulary have been deficient in vigilance, although they certainly failed to anticipate the rising. Less than a fortnight has passed since Lord NAAS assured the House of Commons that there was little or no danger of insurrection, although it was necessary to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act for a short time longer. The precaution had two or three weeks ago been thought superfluous, and but for the abortive disturbance in Kerry, and the alarm at Chester, the Government would at this moment have been obliged to rely on the ordinary course of law, or to calculate on a Bill of indemnity. That informers are always to be hired is as wholesome a superstition as the proverb that "murder will out." In practice it is unfortunately found that murderers often escape detection, and honour sometimes prevails among thieves and Fenians. The traditional contrivances of secret societies are familiar to Irishmen, nor can the acutest policemen always interpret signs and watchwords. It is a more remarkable proof of ingenuity to have imported considerable quantities of arms from America, in spite of the precautions which have been taken by public authorities. Daggers and revolvers are better suited to attacks on isolated police-stations than to open contests with soldiers in the field; but rifles have already been used at Drogheda and elsewhere, and if the insurgents succeed even for a time in making head against the troops, the principal combatants will probably be fully armed. Railways and telegraph wires offer new and unforeseen chances to rebels. Small bodies of men scattered over the country, and, favoured by the inhabitants, may embarrass the arrangements of a Commander-in-Chief for a time, by preventing the transmission of news and the passage of troops. In regular wars each belligerent, as a rule, occupies a separate district, and commands the communications within his own lines. Even the American contest, though in one sense it was a civil war, was carried on by invading armies, and not by sporadic insurrection. Until the Northern armies penetrated the Confederate States, either combatant was master at home, and attacks on railway-stations and telegraphic-posts were regular military operations. The last Polish conflict corresponded more nearly with the warfare which is probably meditated by the Fenian leaders. The insurgents held no place of strength, and they were dispersed over the whole surface of the country; but in Poland there are few railroads for guerilla parties to disturb. Lord STRATHNAIRN must long since have anticipated the possible interruption of the railways, and there is no soldier in the army who is more competent to deal with domestic or foreign enemies. Some of the principal railway-stations have for some time been strongly garrisoned, and there ought to be little delay in repairing the railways. Several armed parties were, on the first outbreak, repulsed in attacks on the police and the military. If larger numbers assemble, it is impossible to believe that they can stand against regular troops.

The insurgents have published a proclamation in which they modestly ask only for the land of Ireland. They, or an indefinite body called the people, are, it seems, the legitimate owners of the soil, which has been usurped by intruders with perhaps no better title than a conveyance for value under the seal of the Encumbered Estates Court. After a Fenian conquest there might perhaps be some difficulties of detail in the appropriation of the spoils. Occupiers who are not Fenians, and Fenians who are not occupiers, would probably differ as to the adjustment of their rival titles. In this respect the Irish insurrection has more sweeping objects than any rebellion known to history. The fundamental rights of private property have never before been openly assailed by the promoters of a revolution. In Poland the landowners have always been the principal agitators for independence, and

in Italy the Governments alone were assailed by professed advocates of legal order. It is impossible to effect a compromise with the armed promoters of so sweeping an innovation. The President of the UNITED STATES not long since informed the English Government that the Fenian invaders were entitled to an amnesty because their enterprise was exclusively political. The violent expropriation of all Irish landowners may perhaps be justified as a social reform; but the issue is one which can only be determined by force. Those who attempt to confiscate a kingdom risk their lives on the venture, and the forfeit is likely to be exacted from the leaders. There can be no hesitation in dealing with opponents who complain of no other grievance than this.

In the same proclamation the organs of the future Irish Republic declare that they have no intention of making war on the people of England. Their hostility is directed only against a bloated aristocracy which protects the Irish landlords in the possession of their estates. As the Fenians lately attempted an invasion of Canada, where there are neither peers nor Irish proprietors, their scrupulous abstinence from unprovoked violence is a novel virtue. Their leaders may be well assured that there is at least one question on which all classes of Englishmen are unanimous. It is not intended that Ireland should, under pretext of independence, become the possession of a foreign enemy. To prevent such a misfortune the property of England would submit to a tax of half its value, and the people, in spite of habits and prejudices, would unanimously applaud a conscription. The American sympathy which sustains the Fenian rebellion will never enable it to assume formidable proportions. A great many rifles and revolvers may be sent across the water, and a certain number of Federal officers may supply the malcontents with the rudiments of military organization; but the English navy will command the coasts of Ireland, and a small portion of the army will easily disperse any untrained masses which may assemble. If Ireland were as large and as thickly inhabited as Poland, a comparatively small number of insurgents might occupy the attention of a considerable force; but the area of the country is limited, and it is intersected by roads and railroads. The Fenians have indeed the power of annoying the Government, because they can destroy for an indefinite time the prosperity of Ireland. The injury which they have already inflicted on all classes of society may be measured by millions. The criminals who await punishment deserve neither sympathy nor indulgence, although all indiscriminate severity ought to be strongly deprecated. The utmost rigour of the law will, with universal approbation, be exerted against the American adventurers who have undertaken the guidance of the rebellion. It would be a source for regret if the report should be confirmed which identifies one of the prisoners with a member of the American Congress, who before his election had pursued the profession of a prizefighter. The criminal, whatever he may be, deserves his fate; but the people of the United States might naturally be annoyed by the public execution even of the least worthy of their representatives. The extreme leniency which has hitherto been shown to Fenian conspirators has produced a beneficial effect on English opinion, although it may have encouraged rebellion by the hope of comparative impunity. All parties now concur in a demand for justice, although there is no symptom of panic, or of the violence which is dictated by fear. Principal traitors must endure the penalty of treason, and legal justice is in this instance sanctioned by moral indignation. There will be no disposition to punish ordinary rebels with exceptional severity; but as long as active insurrection lasts, or whenever it recurs, the utmost exertion of force which may be necessary for its suppression will be strictly within the limits of the law.

The general belief that the insurrection is serious seems to be well founded. The movements which commenced on Wednesday extended across the island, and were evidently planned by persons of some military knowledge. In the neighbourhood of Dublin, and at Drogheda, the rebels proved themselves a cowardly mob as soon as they found themselves in collision with a handful of the constabulary. At present it is impossible to judge whether any other portion of the insurgent force is of better quality; but there can be no doubt that the American-Irish, who have had experience in war, would be formidable opponents if their numbers were considerable. The disturbance is lamentable, and it may probably be troublesome, but it includes none of the elements of possible success which encouraged the rebellion of 1798. At that time England had long been engaged in a disastrous war, and the insurgents had promises of foreign assistance, which was partially afforded. The great bulk of the middle-classes and a section of the gentry were actively disaffected; nor was it certain that the Government

could rely on the loyalty of the Protestants who had themselves only a few years before extorted Parliamentary independence for Ireland by means of the Volunteer organization. The country is now garrisoned by regular troops, in the place of the Yeomanry and Militia of 1798; and all Irishmen who have anything to lose are heartily opposed to the rebellion. Europe is at peace, and the only Power which is likely to sympathize with the Fenians would be too remote to render them efficient aid, even if open interference were probable. No foresight could have guarded against a conspiracy which is in many respects of an unprecedented character. The emigration of vast numbers of Irishmen to America established a hostile community in a foreign country, where it was impossible to control their operations. The animosity, however, of the American-Irish would have produced little practical result if the civil war had not trained large numbers to the use of arms, and at the same time created in the United States a feeling of irritation against England. Generals and colonels who have really served in the grades denoted by their titles naturally impress the Irish imagination with confidence and respect. When the present insurrection has been suppressed and punished, an interval of tranquillity may perhaps once more give Ireland a chance of partial and temporary improvement. The removal of the chronic disease of turbulence can only be the object of vague and distant anticipation.

THE RECENT HISTORY OF REFORM.

WE have had this week a most curious contribution to political history. We have heard the whole story of what has taken place in the Cabinet, as regards Reform, since Lord DERBY took office. Nothing can exceed the candour and copiousness with which the information was given except the marvellous strangeness of the facts disclosed. No comment or criticism is needed. Satire is impossible. The most bitter and the most fanciful satirist would never have dreamt of giving such a picture of the Cabinet as the Cabinet has given of itself. The facts, as disclosed by those principally concerned with them, appear to be these:—When Lord DERBY took office he did so without any pledge to deal with Reform, and General PEEL only accepted a seat in the Cabinet because the Government was unfettered; but Mr. DISRAELI, after he became Minister, publicly used expressions which were taken to mean that the Government would deal with Reform, and almost immediately after the formation of the Government the whole Cabinet, including General PEEL, came to the conclusion that something must be done. Early in the autumn, Lord DERBY wrote to Mr. DISRAELI that Reform must be taken up, and Mr. DISRAELI states that he should not be surprised if Lord DERBY's judgment was in some measure influenced by the keen desire for Reform shown in the great Northern towns. Mr. DISRAELI quite agreed that the Cabinet could not neglect Reform altogether. Lord DERBY had a general and very vague view about a Reform Bill, which he explained to Mr. DISRAELI and perhaps to others, and which was this, that there should be household suffrage, but with some dimly-considered Conservative compensation. The Cabinet, however, never considered this or any other proposal before the opening of Parliament, and the QUEEN'S Speech was framed and spoken with no other understanding than that some sort of Resolutions about Reform should be moved, and that what was wanted was something, though no one knew what, to make Reform safe. All the Ministers concurred in thinking that they had done enough for starting Reform when they had got so far as that, and that the Cabinet was at liberty to ask Parliament once more to discuss Reform, although the Cabinet did not know what it considered would be the right sort of Reform to have. The next duty was to frame the Resolutions, and they got on very harmoniously until they came to the fifth—the fatal fifth Resolution, as General PEEL calls it—and then Lord DERBY seems to have explained that what was meant by it was household suffrage with some compensation, such as an additional vote given to each voter who had more than one kind of qualification. General PEEL at once struck, and offered to resign. He did not believe in compensations, but his colleagues assured him that this was a mere matter of figures, and so he gave in. Lord CRANBORNE tells us most distinctly that the Cabinet came to no definite view as to this fifth Resolution, and Lord DERBY said the same. Apparently the great object of the Ministry was to get the House, or the country, or the *Morning Star*, or in fact any one that liked to interfere, to say what should be the figure of the franchise, and then the Ministry was ready to consider what Conservative compensation should be asked for. All that was understood was, that the fifth Resolution was a mainstay of the Conservative cause, and it was understood in a vague way that it would be so handled

as to work in a manner which Lord CRANBORNE says he and his colleagues thought would be just, but which he personally thought the House of Commons would not accept. When the Resolutions were agreed to by the Cabinet, all that had been decided was to wait till some one outside the Cabinet should fix the figure; and then the Cabinet, viewing compensation as a mere matter of figures, would do a sum more or less like the sum Lord DERBY had done in the early autumn, and in return for lowering the franchise would ask for something which the only Minister who has expressed an opinion on the point thought the House would not grant. All the Ministers seem to have thought this a creditable and satisfactory manner of dealing with the question.

But when the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER introduced these Resolutions on the 11th of February he made a speech which filled some of his colleagues with horror and surprise. The fifth Resolution was the keystone to the Bill which Lord DERBY thought might be adopted; it was the bulwark of the Conservative cause, it contained the only intimation of a policy that was to be found in the Resolutions. But of this Resolution Mr. DISRAELI did not say one single word. He left it to be understood that the Cabinet wished to be guided altogether by the House, and merely explained that he was not to be considered as fishing for a policy. Why Mr. DISRAELI was silent is perfectly obvious after Lord CRANBORNE's explanation. He knew that if he had said what the Cabinet virtually meant him to say—"Our policy is to have a compensation proportionate to the demands made on us. You are free to fix the franchise as you like, and we shall wait till you do fix it; but we shall then ask for a compensation varying according to the figure at which the franchise is fixed"—if he had hinted this in the mildest way, he would undoubtedly have said something which, in Lord CRANBORNE's gentle language, would not have been acceptable to the House of Commons. He therefore took care to say nothing, to commit himself to nothing, and to leave every chance open. But his colleagues were not pleased with this. They felt the absurdity, we may say the disgrace, of coming before the House without any policy whatever. Besides, this did not seem to be true. They had a policy, the policy of the fifth Resolution, and this policy had been wholly ignored by their leader in the House of Commons. They therefore set to work to ask what the fifth Resolution really meant, and this was apparently the first moment when the Cabinet began to have a notion that they ought to arrive at a distinct view of the Reform they wished for. Lord DERBY's plan was put into some sort of shape, and supported by some sort of statistics. Personally, Lord CARNARVON and Lord CRANBORNE knew, what on the previous occasion it had not been thought necessary to explain to General PEEL, that although compensation was a mere matter of figures, yet it made all the difference what particular figures were taken. Previously there had been no clear intimation to the Cabinet what Lord DERBY or any one else proposed, and it was not until five days after Mr. DISRAELI's speech that the proposal was put into shape, and it then seemed quite new to Lord CRANBORNE. He had not previously ascertained what compensation the Cabinet ought to ask, because the House was to fix the figure of the franchise first, and then the Cabinet was to fix the figure of the compensation. But the Cabinet now saw that this would not do. They perceived that, to save their credit, they must have a policy, and that having a policy meant both fixing the franchise and fixing the compensation. On the 16th of February Lord DERBY proposed to his Cabinet that household suffrage should be the basis of the borough franchise, and that he would ask, by way of compensation, some form of plurality of votes. The assumption was that this compensation would be great enough to make household suffrage safe, and the statistics were supposed to show this. But this was a good deal for statistics hastily collected to show all in a moment, and it was decided that further statistics should be procured. It took a week from the time when the proposal was first made to get these more perfect statistics, and they were only submitted to the Cabinet on Saturday, the 23rd. On Monday, the 25th, Mr. DISRAELI was pledged to declare the whole scheme and policy of the Ministry; and, practically, the responsible advisers of the Crown had allowed them one clear Sunday to decide whether the measure they were to recommend would or would not involve a political revolution. Lord CRANBORNE made the most of his Sunday. He worked as hard as he could, he did sum after sum, and on Sunday evening he considered himself to have found out that the compensation was illusory, and that the Government was virtually going to propose household suffrage pure and

simple. He could not honestly recommend this; he communicated his views to Lord CARNARVON and General PEEL, and all three tendered their resignations to Lord DERBY.

But now comes the crowning wonder of this wonderful history. On this Monday morning, when the Cabinet met, Lord DERBY said that he very much regretted that three of his colleagues differed from the rest of the Cabinet, but he thought there was a way of what he pleasantly called compromising the matter. The Bill he wished for, the Bill the great majority of the Cabinet wished for, the Bill the Cabinet had been considering since it had first begun to consider Reform in detail—the only measure it had in fact ever heard of—was not to the taste of some of the Ministers. But a compromise was possible, and he earnestly recommended that it should be adopted. He had got in his pocket the scheme of a Bill of a totally different description, a Bill that the Cabinet had never heard of, founded on a principle quite different from that it had been hitherto considering. He suggested that, as a matter of good feeling, and as a mode of preserving harmony and sociability, and as a general tribute to each other's claims, they should all of a sudden take up this new scheme. Lord CRANBORNE could not help feeling that, however personally flattering to himself and his friends, this was rather an excess of good-nature. It is certainly rather overwhelming for a Prime Minister to say to any one, however distinguished—"I am very sorry you do not like the measure which I think best for the country, and which I have invited you to consider; but, rather than lose you, I will offer to propose, for the acceptance of the country, a measure which is quite new to you, but which must be as unsatisfactory to you as it is to me; so we shall be quits, and that is surely all one gentleman can ask of another." Overpersuaded by this reasoning, Lord CARNARVON, Lord CRANBORNE, and General PEEL consented to the proposal; and on the same evening Mr. DISRAELI announced, as the final and mature scheme of the Cabinet, a measure to which he objected himself, of which the head of the Government disapproved, and which found favour with no one member of the Ministry, and of which the Cabinet had never heard when the sun rose on the day they adopted it. And not only was the wretched measure so framed as to displease every one in the Ministry, but it was so ingeniously contrived as to displease every one of every party outside the Ministry. To none was it more distasteful than to the Conservative party; and in twenty-four hours after the Cabinet had agreed to recommend it, they had arrived at the conclusion to abandon it. Lord DERBY did not resign, but was willing that his dissentient colleagues should resign, which they very gladly did; and the Cabinet has now reverted to the measure which it gave up in deference to the results of Lord CRANBORNE's laborious Sunday. This is the history of Reform under Lord DERBY's Government up to the present time, and it is a history that speaks for itself, and does not need that epithets of sarcasm and invective should be collected to characterise it. But one remark ought to be made. Whatever may be the faults that Lord DERBY may have committed, and they are patent and enormous, he yet ought to have this credit given him, that, at the most critical moment for his Ministry, he has shown himself to be actuated by a high sense of public duty. It can only be because he feels what he owes to the QUEEN and the country that he consents to hold office any longer. Office, always indifferent, must be now odious to him. But he knows, and everyone knows, that it is for the public good that he should hold office a little longer, at whatever cost to his feelings, and under however heavy a load of regret and humiliation.

THE FUTURE OF REFORM.

IF the Ministry is to be kept in to pass a Reform Bill, it must at least be treated as having a right to exist, and must receive the decorous respect due to anything that is allowed to be useful. Nothing can exceed the weakness, the folly, and the incompetence which the Cabinet has hitherto displayed. But it is for the convenience of all parties that this folly should be forgiven and this incompetence be overlooked. If so, the parties that use the Ministry ought not to spoil the efficiency of their own instrument. The Ministry, to succeed, must have a fair chance given it, and it is not to the purpose to say that it does not deserve to exist. Certainly it does not deserve to exist. But if it is without merit, it is not without use. It asks to be allowed to bring in quite a new plan of Reform, what it calls its original plan, a plan hitherto communicated to no one outside the Cabinet. The House of Commons and the country are

agreed that it will answer to let the Ministry make one more attempt to settle the question. If this is to be so, by-gones must be by-gones. It is no good taunting the Government with its past shortcomings; nor does it much signify where the Government is now looking for its allies. Mr. GLADSTONE may reasonably complain, so far as he personally is concerned, that the very same people who a year ago were clamorous against him because he had, as they alleged, suffered himself to be guided by Mr. BRIGHT, are now inclined to sit at Mr. BRIGHT's feet. That Mr. BRIGHT and Mr. DISRAELI should now be such very good friends certainly shows how very hollow is the greater part of the passionate invective poured out by one politician against another. But should Mr. BRIGHT and Mr. DISRAELI together contrive and pass a good Reform Bill, it would be a matter of perfect indifference whether they ought, according to the theory of party politics, to be working together. Mr. DISRAELI can honestly say that, according to his theories, Toryism and Democracy were always viewed as sisters. Mr. BRIGHT may justifiably say that all he cares for is to get what he wants, and that, as he has succeeded in frightening the Conservatives into a panic, he can hope to get more out of them than out of the Opposition. In the actual conflict of parties, and in the excitement of debate, it may perhaps be impossible that taunts should not be uttered and bitter insinuations suggested. But the outside public should discourage such outbursts as much as possible, and those who are sincerely anxious for a settlement of Reform may remind the ardent combatants engaged in the actual struggle that, if time is to be saved, a veil must be thrown over the past, and that a Government in a hopeless minority must seek for allies somewhere. All that is really important is to get a good Bill now, and to have it carried this Session. Fortunately, it is every day becoming clearer to all the world what is meant by a good Bill. We now know what a Bill must contain, and what it must not contain. There are minor points still uncertain. We know how to be on the square, and how to avoid the imputation of chiselling; but we have not as yet got a rule that will measure every fraction correctly, or a plane that will smooth away every knot that we encounter.

It can no longer be doubtful that household suffrage must form the basis of the Bill. All parties, including Lord DERBY himself, seem to be agreed that there is no stopping short of this now. When a quiet, respectable, second-class Conservative like Mr. DUNCOMBE openly announces to a Conservative constituency that he is in favour of household suffrage, when the head of the Government is notoriously in favour of household suffrage, and when Mr. BRIGHT, who was the champion of household suffrage in days when to support household suffrage was thought to be synonymous with supporting a Red Republic, is patronizing the leader of the House of Commons, there can be no question that household suffrage must be the foundation of the Ministerial measure. Long ago, too, many of those who had reflected most seriously on Reform came to the conclusion that, if any change was to be made at all, there was no stopping short of household suffrage, and that 7*l.* rental franchises, 6*l.* rating franchises, and 5*l.* rating franchises were all delusions in the sense that no one could say why one of them was better than another, or why Parliament should adopt any one of them and refuse to go below them. Household suffrage affords a clear, distinct, and, so far as anything is permanent in politics, permanent resting-place. By household suffrage we mean the suffrage of persons who are rated to the relief of the poor, and who have resided for a term sufficient to mark them off from the vagrant poor. Something like the municipal qualification might be used. The voter ought to have been resident for at least two years preceding the 31st of July, and should show that he has paid all rates due on his occupancy before the 1st of the preceding January. At present we do not mean to discuss the matter, or to express any opinion of our own on the subject, till we have seen the measure of the Government, and ascertained the conditions and qualifications which, as we infer from Lord STANLEY's speech, they intend to propose. In the meanwhile, those who think that a 5*l.* rating or a 6*l.* rating would be preferable, may consult the statistics drawn up by Mr. Cox in his able pamphlet on the subject. There are eighty boroughs in which the municipal and the Parliamentary boundaries are the same. In these eighty boroughs household suffrage would give an increase of 36,710 voters. For seventy-six of the boroughs where the municipal and Parliamentary boundaries are not the same, Mr. Cox calculates that the increase would be only 11,200. This is confessedly guesswork. The result is arrived at by taking an average of the population of these boroughs, and allotting an increase accord-

ing to the proportion which this average bears to the average of the populations of the eighty boroughs before mentioned. Still, it may perhaps be a tolerably good guess, and even if we largely increase the number thus arrived at, we still have the result that household suffrage would only add 50,000 voters to the electoral body of 156 boroughs. In large towns the addition would be very much greater. Whether it would be large enough to affect the general character of the representation may be matter calling for consideration. In seventeen boroughs, for example, none of which are among metropolitan boroughs, household suffrage would give more than 100,000 new voters. But the very first object of the new Reform Bill is to let the resident inhabitants of the great towns of England have an opportunity of recording their votes and expressing their wishes and opinions. At the same time, we do not think it possible to limit the extension of the suffrage to ratepaying householders. There are persons who do not pay rates and are not householders, but are yet very well fitted to vote at borough elections, and whose intelligence, worth, and position render it impossible to exclude them from the franchise without obvious injustice. We agree with Lord CARNARVON that any measure would be a bad one which left all political power in the hands of two classes, the rich and the poor. The intermediate classes also have a strong claim to consideration. It is not in any degree by way of compensation for household suffrage that we urge the claims of such persons to the franchise, but simply on the ground that, if householders are to be represented, such a measure would be clearly just. To take one case in point—in many large towns the class of people who most warmly demand, and most clearly deserve, enfranchisement live in lodgings, because houses are not to be had. The question is whether the demand of this class is to be met by creating a lodger franchise, as in the Bill of last year, or whether lodgers should only be allowed to vote when they are something more than lodgers, and give some palpable sign of respectability, or contribute directly to taxation. This is a point of detail which is sure to be considered as the Bill receives discussion in Committee. But among the alternatives of a lodger franchise which have been proposed, that of the payment of direct taxes is clearly the best. Every artisan receiving good wages according to the standard of skilled labour ought, under the present law, to pay Income-tax; and if he is made to fulfil his legal obligations, as he ought to be, he will have qualified himself to vote. The possession of money in the savings-banks or funds is often merely an accidental merit, and would chiefly enfranchise the class least deserving of the franchise—that of domestic servants.

And if it is admitted that the Bill must contain household suffrage in boroughs, it is equally clear that the Bill must not contain what Mr. DISRAELI explained to be a part of the original project of the Government. This was intended to be a compensation for household suffrage, and was to the effect that voters might have two votes, if they could vote under different qualifications. A householder, for example, who paid Income-tax would vote once for his house and once for his Income-tax, whereas the poorer man, who had a house but did not pay Income-tax, would have only one vote. This, it is understood, is not a part of the original project to which the Ministry now intends to revert; and it may be no use killing a corpse. But if there is any one who regrets the abandonment of this proposal, let him consider that this is but one form of giving two votes to the rich man because he is rich, and that, at this particular moment of English history, it would be equally practical to propose to give a man two votes because he had red hair. How does it happen that one householder pays Income-tax and another not? Because the former is richer. Of course the payment of Income-tax is a very good reason why a man should have one vote, but it is no reason at all why he should have two. And why, again, has one householder taken a degree and another not? In nine cases out of ten, the only reason is that the former could afford a more expensive education. Taught by experience, and made wiser by the reflections forced on them, the Ministry will probably not seek compensation in this way. Numerous advisers urge them to seek compensation in the system of what is called cumulative voting. We observe that a large, perhaps the larger, portion of those who recommend this system now limit their proposal to those constituencies which have, or can be made to have, three members. This is not a very grand scheme by way of compensation, and it will be time enough to deal with it and examine it in all its bearings when we see what shape it assumes, and whether it seriously engages the at-

tention of Parliament. There are, however, other and simpler modes of attaining this object. The real field for compensation and the real difficulty of the Reform Bill lies in the redistribution of seats. All other parts of the Reform Bill are child's play to this. All we can at present be sure of is that the proposal made by Mr. DISRAELI will not do. The first thing to aim at is to pass such a Reform Bill as a Reformed Parliament would allow to stand, and it cannot be conceived that a Reformed Parliament would be content with taking twenty-three seats away from the small boroughs. Redistribution must go further than this now, or it will be carried much further in a year or two. We are aware that the Conservatives might here find a point on which they could act with Mr. BRIGHT. They would like to narrow the present scheme of redistribution because it sounds Conservative, and pleases interested persons to do so. Mr. BRIGHT would like it, because he must know that, the smaller the scheme of redistribution is now, the larger will be the scheme for which it will be possible to agitate after the Bill of this Session is passed. But those who wish to dispose of the question as a whole, and so as to set it at rest for some time, can fall in with neither of these views, and must desire that redistribution should be handled in a manner at once large and equitable.

AMERICA.

THE Thirty-ninth Congress of the United States completed its term on the 4th of March, and the Fortieth Congress, consisting principally of the same members, commenced its first Session on the same day. Before the war, the Senate exercised considerable influence in its executive capacity, and through the personal weight of its principal members; but it was only in exceptional cases that the House of Representatives emerged from its powerless obscurity. The right of imposing taxes was inoperative in the presence of a large surplus revenue, and a share in legislation was merely nominal as long as no new laws were required. From 1797 to 1866 the PRESIDENT concentrated in his own person all the principal attributes of the Government, and he might have been envied by many an absolute monarch but for the limited area of his almost uncontrolled authority. The chief ruler of the Federation had few opportunities of direct action on the citizens of any State in the Union. The United States had a nominal army, a small navy, and, with the exception of a few scores of marshals, it had no police. When a great emergency rendered it necessary to create a central power, Mr. LINCOLN assumed, with general assent, the dictatorship which seemed properly to belong to his high office. The new phrase of "war-power" justified numerous encroachments on personal liberty and on the rights of the States; and the PRESIDENT, at his sole discretion, effected an act of organic legislation by decreeing the abolition of slavery in all the insurgent States. Without a pretext of legal or constitutional right, Mr. LINCOLN created in Louisiana a fictitious commonwealth governed by a conforming minority, in the expectation that it would provisionally serve as a model to other States as they were successively conquered by the Northern arms. No ruler, however, was ever less inclined to permanent usurpation, nor had Mr. LINCOLN at any time anticipated a revolution as the result of a successful war. At the beginning of the contest he would gladly have concluded peace without conditions; and to the last he only insisted on the abolition of slavery, and the acknowledgment of the supremacy of the United States. If he had lived, he would have advanced at least as far as his successor in the path of reconstruction; and the popular confidence which he had well deserved would probably have supported him in the continuance of his consistent policy. Mr. ANDREW JOHNSON had less claim to indulgence or to trust, and his patriotism was disfigured by passion and indiscretion. His enemies have often pointed out the inconsistency between his frequent appeals to the Constitution and his arbitrary appointment of temporary Governments in the conquered States. His excuse was that it was necessary to meet unprecedented difficulties with extraordinary measures, and that he afterwards took the earliest opportunity of restoring regular Governments in the South. Himself a Southern citizen, and formerly a slaveholder, he was utterly opposed to the confiscation of State rights, and to the project of governing the Southern States by the agency of negro voters. In his judgment, the primary object of the war had been attained by the destruction of the Confederate Government; and the seceding communities had paid, in the emancipation of the slaves, a heavy fine for the error of insurrection.

The PRESIDENT might perhaps in any case have defied opposition, but it is more certain that he miscalculated the tendency

of opinion in the North. The great majority of the dominant Republican party repudiated a policy which seemed to offer no substantial compensation for unbounded sacrifices. The usual fortune of civil war had converted the defeated party into traitors, and unsuccessful resistance was condemned as criminal rebellion. The Americans are neither vindictive nor cruel, but in political discussion they always use strong language, which they sometimes think it necessary to translate into acts. A more legitimate reason for imposing conditions on the conquered States consisted in the duty of providing for the liberated slaves security against possible oppression on the part of their former masters. The PRESIDENT, while he acknowledged the claims of the freedmen on their patrons, nevertheless held that the Southern people understood the negro best, and that interference would only embitter the relations between the superior and inferior races. The extreme Republicans, sharing the strange national superstition in favour of universal suffrage, demanded for the negroes the elective franchise, as the only means by which they could protect themselves against oppression. The PRESIDENT and the Democratic party replied that the regulation of the franchise belonged exclusively to the competence of the several States, and that neither the PRESIDENT nor the Congress had the right to enforce negro suffrage, except by a regular change in the Constitution. The Constitutional Amendment which was passed by the necessary plurality of votes in Congress, during the Session of 1866, was a compromise between extreme opinions. The question of negro suffrage was waived, but the electoral power of the South was reduced by the number of the unenfranchised population; and the Amendment would have been readily accepted but for the useless and invidious disqualification of all the most respectable citizens of the South, on the ground of their unanimous adhesion to the Confederacy.

During the recent Session the majority in Congress has been engaged in efforts to evade or to remodel the Constitution. The moderate minority of the Republicans have been forced to abandon their separate position, and to fall back into the ranks of the party; and the leaders of the House of Representatives openly avow their desire to postpone reconstruction until the next Presidential election has been completed by the exclusive votes of the Northern States. Mr. STEVENS, who has shown himself the most formidable enemy of the PRESIDENT and of the South, lately avowed his own indifference to the adoption of any measures which might facilitate the restoration of the Union. At the close of the Session the House of Representatives passed a Bill for establishing military law in the South for an indefinite period; yet the difficulties of the case were involuntarily admitted by a provision that commanding officers might, at their discretion, allow the exercise of civil jurisdiction. The preamble of the Bill recited the non-existence of any State Governments in ten States of the former Union; yet it is evident that any civil Court must derive its authority from the very Governments which are negatived by the framers of the Bill. The Senate, which has throughout the Session been a degree less intemperate than the House, returned the Bill with amendments which in some degree modified the extravagance of its provisions. It had not been the object of the extreme party to provide for good administration in the South, but to assert the unlimited power of the Northern States as it is exercised by Congress. Mr. STEVENS accordingly, in the first instance, defeated the Bill by a coalition with the Democrats, who wisely discourage all attempts at moderation on the part of their opponents. A second Bill embodying the Senate's amendments was finally settled in a Conference between the Houses; and henceforth the law, as enacted by Congress, directly contravenes the Constitution, as well as the first principles of liberty.

There is always a probability of at least partial error in judgments formed by foreigners on political controversies. Language has different shades of meaning in England and in America, and declamation often requires transposition into a different key to make it intelligible to unaccustomed ears. Political leaders, and still more certainly great parties, are always influenced by motives, even when it is difficult to assign reasons for their conduct. The Republicans probably mean something less than they say, or perhaps something different; but, after all reserves and allowances, it can scarcely be doubted that the late Congress entangled itself in a policy without a practicable issue. The anticipation that the disruption of 1861 would be final was so far falsified that secession was forcibly suppressed; but the restoration of common republican action seems to be still remote. The amended Bill of the Senate, which was not strong enough for the taste of the dominant party in the House, contains the monstrous stipulation that all Southern negroes should

enjoy the franchise, from which all who had shared in the so-called rebellion were to be excluded. No tyrant who was also a statesman would adopt so extravagant a contrivance for inverting the order of political society. The disloyal citizens of Virginia or of South Carolina are, with a few disreputable exceptions, the entire white population of their respective States; and the expectation that they would submit to be governed by their liberated slaves can only be justified by an intention of employing a military force which would render all representative government superfluous. An additional absurdity in the projected legislation consists in the right of the President to command the army while it is employed in trampling under foot the Constitution which he is determined to defend. The low intellectual level of the debates in Congress confirms the distrust which is felt in the wisdom of their deliberations. It is surprising that the nation which boasts with reason of the widest diffusion of intelligence should be content to be represented by members who talk like small tradesmen at a parish vestry. A tariff passed in defiance of the plainest rules of economy, and a mass of inextricable confusion in political conduct, will be recorded in history as the sole achievements of the Thirty-ninth Congress.

MORE BISHOPS.

THE deputation which recently waited upon the Prime Minister, backed by the formal and weighty introduction of the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, to urge the necessity of increasing the number of English Bishops, can scarcely be congratulated on any substantial success. Reasonably enough, the Church may have expected from a Conservative Government something more than the tepid recognition with which Earl DERBY met a request which could scarcely have been bowed out with fainter courtesy. Is it, in this as in other matters, that the statesman is returning to his old principles, and that the suppressor of the Irish Bishops is scarcely content to go down into history stamped with the inconsistency of restoring in his cooler age what he destroyed in his hot youth? The question itself is one of elementary common sense if treated only on those level grounds on which the deputation ought to have taken its stand. Given twenty-six Bishops in HENRY VIII.'s time, and it requires only a sum in arithmetic to say how many Bishops there ought to be in the reign of Queen VICTORIA. If 10,000 clergymen, more than three centuries ago, wanted so many dioceses, how many are necessary for more than 20,000? If it has been found possible by a Whig Minister, by dodging and manipulating existing machinery, actually to get into existence such ecclesiastical innovations as a Bishop of Ripon and a Bishop of Manchester without encumbering or adorning certain benches in the House of Peers with a single new spiritual Lord, why should it be not thought reasonable that a Conservative Government should be asked to fulfil a pledge given by Earl RUSSELL himself twenty years ago; especially when it is made plain that the country will not be called on to pay for a Bishop of St. Columb, a Bishop of St. Alban's, a Bishop of Southwell, or a Bishop of Liverpool? There can be no answer which embodies any substantial argument against such a self-evident proposition. It is almost with a smile that one reads of the grave Metropolitan and his train of excellent friends, representing a large Society, feeling themselves called upon to urge such platitudes as that, in an Episcopal Church, Bishops are of the essence of the organization, and that, to carry out the essential purpose of an institution, its main object must be efficiently provided for. But we suppose this mild line of argument is necessary in a day of very small things, when the *Times* has the effrontery to argue, or at least to let its Presbyterian friends argue, that the fewer Bishops the Church of England has, and the more they are of the "TULCHAN" sort, the better for the Church. This suggestion is only impertinent, but it rises into something more serious than impertinence when it is backed by an alleged constitutional maxim that an Establishment, by accepting what is called State protection, abandons all inherent obligation to increase its efficiency, and surrenders the right to provide for its own inner life and strength by a bargain to be content for ever with a dole of starvation rations. When these views can be proclaimed with even an attempt at seriousness, it is quite superfluous for deputations to pronounce on such common-sense topics as those of statistics and comparative testimony. It is superfluous to point out that the Church in the United States—which knows its own needs, and takes its own way of meeting them—has forty-four Bishops to 2,300 clergy; and it is equally otiose to plead "that the Church of England is the only religious community in this country which is not

"able to increase the number of its chief ministers according to the increase of its population, and according to their needs and desires"—which is the plaintive language adopted in the memorial presented by the ARCHBISHOP. And it is equally superfluous to urge that, while there are such overgrown, unmanageable, and inconsistent dioceses as Lincoln, Southwell, Exeter, Chester, and London, there are such noble churches as St. Albans, Southwark, and possibly St. Colomb, whose useless stones cry out for a Bishop.

The coldness with which Earl DERBY accepted the memorial presented by the ARCHBISHOP is perhaps intelligible. He avowed, and he could not be contradicted, that the apathy of the Bishops themselves on the question is the strongest objection to any Government moving in the matter. It is well known that in some sections of the Bench considerable jealousy is felt at the suggestion. Some Bishops have not hesitated to hint that railroads and the penny-post are a very fair substitute for living men, and that pliable archdeacons, percontatorial rural deans, and chaplains on the prowl, so materially relieve the Bishop from seeing with his own eyes, that a distant and calm Olympus of inaccessible prelates, interfering only when they cannot help interfering, will form the best Corinthian capital of the Church, which thus becomes in something more than figure the pillar, not only of truth, but of æsthetic beauty. Nor must it be forgotten that even sincere friends of the Church make too much of the caution *ne vilesat Episcopatus*, and are apprehensive that familiarity will breed contempt, and that the proposed creation of Bishops who receive neither 5,000*l.* a year nor the honours of Parliament will be a blot on the dignity of the Establishment. These considerations might, one would think, be left for Churchmen to settle. If they think that a subdivision of dioceses would be well purchased by the existence of cheaper Bishops, this is the Church's affair; and great as is a Churchman's reverence for the sacred number of Twenty-six, he cannot always be called upon to forget that, like COWPER's tithe-payer, he finds this mystic numeral plaguy dear in other matters than the pocket. But there is a more serious difficulty, of which Lord DERBY may be fairly excused for seeing the great force, than that presented by the apathy of the Bishops. We refer to an alternative scheme offered by the deputation.

The memorial presented by the Archbishop had two strings. It proposed—1. The extension of the Episcopate on the intelligible form of the division of the existing dioceses. 2. And—or was it *or*?—the appointment of so-called Suffragans by the revival or improvement of an old statute of Henry VIII., dating before the Reformation, or at least before the existence of the Book of Common Prayer. We can only consider this double-faced plan as a great mistake. The division of dioceses is plain, intelligible, and forms a scheme wholly unassailable. It involves no archaisms, and no tricks and qualifications and limitations. It is straightforward and simple, and, to adopt a familiar phrase, it may be, as a Reform, new, but is not newfangled. Lord DERBY was quite justified in saying that this "question of Suffragan Bishops was started 'officially almost for the first time'; and official personages naturally recoil from strange visitors in the shape of obsolete Acts of Parliament, grim with the dust and rust of centuries of disuse. An English Bishop, a Bishop of the old type, or even a new Bishop cast in the old mould, is intelligible to the average mind of man; but what are we to think of a new order of Bishops, these suggested Suffragans, who are only half Bishops, and whose value is summed up in the Bishop of OXFORD's sanguine anticipatory description of them as officials, who are to "possess no ecclesiastical power, jurisdiction, or right whatever, except what was assigned to them by the Bishop asking assistance, and whose authority would be revocable at the request of the Bishop, and would expire with the demise of the Bishop recommending them"—that is, a sort of stipendiary episcopal curates, whose practical episcopate might be suppressed in a moment, or perhaps at Mrs. PROUDIE's dictation. We own that we can quite understand, and, understanding, reject this curious ecclesiastical neologism. Sir WILLIAM HEATHCOTE and the Bishop of OXFORD may believe that the multiplication of prim gentlemen wearing lawn sleeves in the position of "retired Colonial Bishops" would be a pleasing variety in the dulness of the genus *Episcopus*. We must, however, own that neither experience nor theory makes us enthusiastic about these so-called Suffragans, modelled after the fashion of a "Colonial" unattached. It is a small objection that the term "Suffragan" is a technical misnomer; for the scentless Episcopal rose would be none the sweeter were it more accurately described as a Coadjutor *sine jure successionis*, or even as a *Chorepiscopus*. It is the creature, not his place in scientific terminology,

that we cannot make up our minds to. SYDNEY SMITH used to sneer at "gig Bishops." The new form of Bishops would scarcely rise to the dignity of a gig; and on the whole we think it would be rather better to abridge than to increase the facilities which an incapable, or even a conscientious, Bishop at present possesses of holding on to a see which he is incapable of managing. Let a provision, in the shape of a general measure, be made for facilitating the retirement of all Bishops, and let the dioceses which require it be at once and honestly divided, and there is no place left either for Suffragans or Coadjutors or "Colonials" unattached. We do not pretend, of course, as simple lay folk, to be supposed to know in what the episcopal idea of essence consists. It is too subtle for ordinary comprehension; and the deputation and memorialists are of course better judges of what they want to create than outsiders can be. But in a little work which we have met with we find certain functions—such as "feeding the flock," "diligently preaching the Word," "duly administering godly discipline," "governing the Church," "correcting and punishing such as be unquiet, disobedient, and criminous within their dioceses"—assumed as belonging to "all Bishops," "according to such authority as they have by God's Word." These standards and claims, we admit, are high, and mean a good deal; but be this as it may, this is what the Prayer-book describes as the Bishop's office and function. This Bishop, and this sort of Bishop, with certain lofty, inherent, and, as they say, indelible functions, is an intelligible Bishop. It may be a right or a wrong thing—we cannot say; opinions differ. But a Bishop with these rights and duties inseparable from his order is a consistent, tangible, logical *ens*; and more than this, he is the only sort of Bishop which the Church of England is capable of ordaining. It is very well for Bishops and deputations to say that they "do not want two orders of Bishops." But how the Bishop of the Prayer-book and the Bishop of the memorialists and deputation, with "no ecclesiastical power, jurisdiction, or right whatever except what is delegated" by (*ex hypothesis*) an imbecile or a paralytic, can be reconciled, puzzles us. Nor can we quite understand how any clergyman with even moderate self-respect, and with any Anglican views of the episcopal character—we use the word in its technical sense—could submit himself to assume an episcopate of which the soul and life is extirpated. A pleasant and honourable life certainly is foreshadowed for these "Suffragans" by their chief advocate, who sketched out their dignified orbit. "Suppose, for instance, there was an aged Bishop who desired to have a Suffragan Bishop to assist him in his duties, that Suffragan would, on the decease of the aged Bishop, be enabled by a new Commission to serve some other aged Bishop"—and so on till the Suffragan himself requires suffraganizing into Nirvana or the Limbus Episcoporum. A lively and agreeable life this, for a scholar and gentleman—to be reduced to a confirming and consecrating machine, a sort of railway travelling episcopal bagman executing orders, and liable to be cashiered by telegraph. We always thought that Mrs. GAMP's cyclical existence, revolving from groaning to groaning, and from one sick job to another, was about the heaviest lot of human-kind; but "a Suffragan" circulating from "one aged Bishop to another aged Bishop," it is some credit to our forefathers to say, never has existed among us, and we are by no means anxious to see his possibility made a matter of experiment.

THE REPRESENTATION OF SCOTLAND.

THE Scotch members supported, with the unanimity which might have been anticipated, Sir WILLIAM STIRLING MAXWELL's demand for an increase in the representation of Scotland. Mr. DISRAELI intimated a desire to comply with this request, if the object can be attained without prejudice to the arrangements of the English Reform Bill. In simpler language, the total number of members is to be increased, if the Scotch insist on an addition to their own Parliamentary strength. If the question were of primary importance, it is evident that the representation of the United Kingdom ought to be included in a single scheme; for the existing proportions of electoral power may be equally disturbed by an uncompensated grant of new members to Scotland, and by a transfer of the privilege of representation from one part of the kingdom to another. The addition of seven members by the scheme of the late Ministry would have added double the number to the relative strength of Scotland, because the increase would have been provided at the expense of England and Wales. If Mr. DISRAELI is equally liberal to Scotland, he will effect his object by a process which will confer a smaller

proportional advantage; but there is fortunately no conflict of interests, and there is little jealousy between the Northern and Southern portions of the kingdom. If the people of Scotland really wish for additional members, there are strong reasons for gratifying their desire. They possess more than an average share of intelligence and independence, and they have, during the present generation, advanced in commerce and industry even more rapidly than their neighbours. No good reason can be given for allowing Rutlandshire twice the representative power of Lanarkshire, except that the inequality is due to a casual origin, and that it produces comparatively little inconvenience. The Scotch, under the present Parliamentary Constitution, have found it possible to take care of themselves; and consequently there is little enthusiasm, and less bitterness, in their occasional complaints of insufficient representation. In no other part of the world have Federal or Imperial supremacy, and Provincial or State rights, been reconciled with equal success. The Scotch members, instead of wasting their time in clamour against foreign usurpation, have contrived to reserve to themselves the exclusive management of their own affairs, and at the same time to exercise due influence on the course of national policy. If their number were doubled, there would be a larger standing committee on local business; but while the counties continued, as at present, to balance the boroughs, no perceptible effect on party politics would be produced. When an alteration in the law of hypothec or of multiple-poining is introduced into either House of Parliament, English peers and members are instantly reminded by the unfamiliar sound that it is not their business to prick their fingers by meddling with the Northern thistle. If Scotch lawyers and laymen objected to the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords, no alien would dispute their claim to dispose finally, as well as in the first instance, of their own litigation. An irritable Presbyterian now and then writes to the *Times* to complain of the toleration which has, during the last hundred years, been accorded to prelacy and Anglicanism, but, on the whole, his countrymen are not dissatisfied with the results of that Union which their ancestors denounced as sad and sorrowful. If they had depended exclusively on the candour and liberality of England, the anticipation of evil might perhaps have been justified by the result; but Scotchmen are not made to be oppressed, inasmuch as no European race is of tougher or sounder fibre. Before 1832 their representative system was almost illusory, but the oligarchy which possessed a monopoly of power was essentially Scotch. By a natural reaction, the boroughs have since the Reform Bill accepted only Liberal candidates; and the few contests which have occurred have generally turned on some local dispute or ecclesiastical squabble. The constituency of Edinburgh is at this moment dissatisfied with the more eminent of its two representatives, because he objects to the disturbance of a recent compromise by which the dispute on the Annuity-tax was supposed to have been settled. With respect to all such questions the Southern mind is a blank. The sitting member or his successor will vote on the Liberal side in the House of Commons, and the Annuity-tax will be retained or abolished as the majority of Scotch members may decide. Sir JAMES GRAHAM, though he was himself half a Scotchman, only involved himself and his colleagues in trouble when he undertook the thankless task of legislating for the Scotch Established Church. All such questions are more prudently left to the little Scotch Parliament which meets periodically, in some Committee-room, to consider the Bills which are afterwards formally submitted to the House of Commons and the House of Lords. The Irish members have, for obvious reasons, always failed in their attempts to create a similar organization. It is on provincial questions that Scotch members are united by a sympathy which overrules minor differences of opinion, and that Irishmen are irrevocably divided.

If the House of Commons ever arrives at the discussion of a Scotch Reform Bill, the arguments which were used in the recent conversation will perhaps not be found conclusive. All enumerations of population and rateable value may be answered by a reference to the corresponding metropolitan statistics. Suburbs as large as ordinary boroughs grow up annually round London, and three millions of inhabitants divide among them in unequal portions almost incalculable wealth; yet no moderate politician desires to give sixty or seventy members to one vast and inorganic city. In virtue of its own historical unity, and of the distinctive character which has consequently been formed, Scotland has a claim to a considerable share of political power; but the exact proportion must be determined by considerations of opportunity and convenience, and it is fortunately not necessary to arrive at a

precisely accurate conclusion. It is evidently desirable that Dundee and some other large constituencies should return a second member, and the Scotch Universities have at least as good a claim to representation as the London graduates. The educated middle-class of Scotland would almost certainly prefer an able and eminent candidate. The same electors have in their boyhood keenly contested the honorary nomination of Lord Rectors, and, on the whole, they have exercised creditable discrimination in their choice. The majority of voters in the London University would belong to the highly respectable profession of medicine; and English University elections are controlled by the clergy. Scottish graduates would perhaps be more miscellaneous in their pursuits, and they are closely connected, as in Germany, with almost all classes of society. The fashion of taking a degree would soon become general if a barren title were combined with the privilege of belonging to the first constituency in Scotland.

There are so many indications of an approaching reconstitution of political parties that the bearing of electoral changes on the interests either of Conservatives or of Liberals scarcely admits of confident calculation. From the Reform Bill to the general election of 1865 the great landowners almost universally controlled the county representation of Scotland; but at the last election the party which has always held exclusive possession of the boroughs engaged in some close contests, and won two or three seats. The tenant-farmers, holding long leases, are thoroughly independent, and, whenever they differ in political opinions from their landlords, they have the power of returning the county members. The preservation of game, which forms almost the only serious matter of disagreement, may easily be regulated and modified by an amicable understanding; and the combinations which the agricultural labourers have recently formed, in imitation of the 'Trades' Unions, will have a tendency to cement the union between the landowners and the farmers. The wealthier and more intelligent portion of the borough electors will in many places separate themselves more and more from the more democratic section of the party. The threatened contest at Edinburgh between the respective supporters of Mr. MONCRIEFF and Mr. M'LAREN will probably be repeated in other parts of Scotland. At the last election Mr. BLACK was rejected on account of his opposition to Mr. GLADSTONE'S Reform Bill. The next object of attack is the Lord Advocate of the GLADSTONE Ministry, and the moderate party will fight the battle with the advantage of supporting a candidate who is personally eminent. The Scotch have a creditable inclination to respect intellect, and the constituency of Edinburgh repented and retrieved the error of expelling Mr. MACAULAY from the representation of the city on fanatical or sectarian grounds. Ten years hence the Scotch members will be distributed, as at present, between two parties, under perhaps different names; but there is no danger that they will either relax their vigilance in the management of their own affairs, or form a local faction to impede the conduct of political business. The friendly union of the American States was virtually dissolved as soon as contending parties were divided by a geographical boundary; and Irish politicians have often attempted, with partial success, to create a similar opposition between their own country and Great Britain. Scotland has had the peculiar merit of combining the maintenance of nationality with the advantages of annexation to a larger political community. With or without additional members, Scotchmen will, in the future as in the past, secure their full share of Parliamentary influence and official power.

THE AMALGAMATED SOCIETY OF CARPENTERS.

THE current number of the *Fortnightly Review* contains an article, written by Professor BEESLEY, on the organized association of Carpenters. After naming the author, it is needless to say that the essay embodies everything that is favourable, and avoids everything that is unfavourable, to the organization and its principles. To use an illustration which the *Fortnightly Reviewer* himself would probably use, it no more gives us an insight into the interior economy and essential character of such societies than an essay on the British Constitution would give a foreigner an insight into the actual working of our Parliamentary Government. The only work which could give us a true insight into the inner life of these establishments would be the plain and genuine autobiography of an artisan member. Till we get this—and fear of his fellows, no less than love of fine writing, will perhaps prevent any artisan from ever writing it—we shall know little more of these institutions than a man who has only looked at

anatomical pictures knows of the structure of the human frame.

Yet even the outside knowledge which Mr. BEESLEY'S article conveys is not without interest and use. From him we learn the following facts. The association consists of 190 branches, comprising 8,256 members. Each branch is a complete body in itself, holding its own funds and managing its own affairs. A branch may consist of not less than seven, and not more than three hundred, members. The central authority is vested in a General Council, consisting of sixteen members and a President. Practically, the management rests with the six London members, who are called the Executive Council. The Executive hears appeals from the local branches, makes orders on them for payments of money, and gives its decisions as to strikes and as to the institution of legal proceedings. "Though," says Mr. BEESLEY, "each branch is a complete Union in itself, the funds belong to the Society as a whole;" and a general diffusion of their moneys is somehow effected by the Executive, so that no large sum is ever deposited at headquarters, and each branch begins the new year with the same amount of money for each member. The general effect of the organization is this. Each member pays either 1s. or 9d. per week. In the former case, he is entitled to all benefits; in the latter, to all except sick-benefits. In the former case, if he loses his tools by fire, water, or theft, he receives their full value. When sick, he receives 12s. a week for twenty-six weeks, and 6s. a week as long as illness continues. When he is fifty years old, if he is incapacitated for work, he receives 8s. a week after twenty-five years' membership, and 5s. after twelve years. Then there is the usual provision for funeral expenses. In all these provisions, the example of Friendly and Benefit Societies is copied. Indeed, the Friendly and other societies of the same kind are the original germ of all these unions; and these societies originally were either instituted, or fostered and developed, by a class above that which profits by them. Of course a partisan writer like Mr. BEESLEY cares nothing for this. But it would, in truth, be a very interesting study to trace the history of the associative principle among workmen, from the day when it was first cradled and fostered into strength by their friends and protectors among the middle-classes. When once its value had been tried, it grew more expansive and more robust. In all that we have quoted about the Carpenters' Association there is much that is highly beneficial to its own members, and perfectly innoxious to all other persons. But it is the very exaggeration of bombast to say, as Mr. BEESLEY says, that "to belong to such a society is an education far more efficacious for all practical and political purposes than any training gone through by the majority of the wealthier classes." All England is associative. Why, there is not a public school where there are not half a dozen "unions" or societies of some kind or other—boating, cricketing, debating, what not; where the ingenuity, accuracy, and readiness of the boys are not equally taxed, either in the selection of articles for the club, the payment of subscriptions, the exaction or the avoidance of fines, the keeping of the accounts, and a dozen other matters. We do not deny that it is a very good thing in every way for a working-man to be a member of a club, and to take even a merely mechanical part in the management of its money and its policy. But so it is for any man to be a member of any similar association, and to occupy himself with its business. If this gives a high political education, none ought to be better educated politically than the members and shareholders of all the trading companies now extant. By this time, at any rate, their financial education must be complete. Mr. BEESLEY will of course point derisively to the failures and disasters of 1866, and exalt the working-man by the depreciation of the capitalist. To this it may be answered that the shareholders allowed their faith in their managers and directors to get the better of their intelligence. And what proof is there that these amalgamated artisans will not do the same thing? The real motive or governing power necessarily rests in the intelligent few; the majority probably consists of a mute, manageable, and docile mob, whose practical and political education is confined to doing as their leaders bid them. They are too young yet to have established a character beyond impeachment or doubt.

But the objects of this association go very much beyond those of an ordinary benefit club. It attains another object eminently beneficial to its own members, and at variance, more or less directly, with the interests of others. By guaranteeing a weekly payment to every man who, from whatever cause, is out of work, and by giving a larger amount to any man who leaves his employer "under circumstances satisfactory to the Executive Council," the

association virtually supports the system of strikes. Mr. BEESLEY quaintly defines the power of the Executive to be the right of putting a veto on strikes. When strikes will not "pay" it probably does veto them. But if it does prevent some, it directs, regulates, and confirms others. Suppose that, instead of about 8,000 carpenters, all the carpenters of the kingdom belonged to the society, and that a local branch struck for higher wages. The association would then prevent any carpenters from going to that place. There would, on the hypothesis we have assumed, be no outsiders. The association would have all the carpenters in England under its control. None of its members could engage themselves without its permission. Those who did engage themselves would do so only for the wages for which one of its branches had already struck. Again, a similar process might take place elsewhere; a higher rate still might be demanded; and under the auspices of the Executive it might be conceded. Suppose that, instead of being confined to carpenters, it extended to all the building trades. Exactly the same thing would happen with them, until the highest attainable limit of wages was reached—i.e. until the employer contented himself with the barest assignable margin of profit. Probably the men in the Executive Council would be lenient and moderate enough not to push matters too far. They would feel that they were killing the goose that laid the golden eggs. Mr. BEESLEY quotes instances where this association resisted strikes which were brought about by men who did not belong to it. This is probably true. One association differs from another in policy, prudence, and management. Enough, however, is known to show that against these associations, even acting separately, employers are powerless. What must they be, then, when the associations are combined?

Mr. BEESLEY looks with complacent benignity on the whole affair. He shows us the Executive of the body tabulating the whole country according to the supply or dearth of labour, the fulness or slackness of employment; sending men from the overcrowded labour-market of A to satisfy the requirements of B, transferring some from C to D, others to F, and so on, just as EUGÈNE SUE pictures the Superior of the Jesuits manœuvring his fraternity. And he remarks exultingly that these associations of operatives are doing that for themselves which the capitalists ought to have done for the country long ago. In fact, he seems to hint at a probable result of these associations which has already occurred to several persons. The associations are a partial restoration of the ancient guilds, so long discredited by political economists. They are the guilds without the masters. If the masters were only added, we should have the guilds again. And what would come with them? Protection, so far as it was within the power of the guilds to enforce it. Rules and regulations, not for the advantage of the employed as against the employers, but of the employers and employed against the general public. No foreign workman and no foreign work would be allowed wherever they were engaged. The circle of exclusion would widen—as it has widened in Australia and California—in proportion to the political power attained by the members of the guilds.

It is questionable whether the inconveniences arising from this condition of things would be much greater than many of us actually suffer under the existing system. Whoever has the misfortune to deal with any of the tribe of house-agents, house-decorators, or builders, resigns himself beforehand to the most frightful extortion. He knows it is useless to complain. There is one answer ready on the lips of every contractor:—"Ah, Sir! we pay such high wages; my men are getting 8d. and 10d. the hour. That's what makes the work so dear." In fact, the best remedy for these charges has never yet been tried—perhaps is not likely to be tried. If every one would indefinitely postpone all building projects that are not absolutely indispensable, the general abstinence from bricks and mortar, combined with the improved discretion of the Finance Companies, might bring both contractors and associations to some common consideration for that ill-treated *bonhomme*, the British public. At present, employers and associations seem to think that they are the only two parties interested in the question of wages.

As to the political part of the subject, Mr. BEESLEY rides off on a very imaginative PEGASUS. When he taunts Mr. LOWE with the statistical knowledge and capacity for organization exhibited by the "despised and ignorant workman, the drunken and venal being," he knows just as well as we do that he is doing what every educated man should be ashamed of doing—talking "bosh" to tickle the ears of the groundlings. He knows full well that some of the workmen, even among the

carpenters, are drunken and venal; that they love their beer, and would not repudiate a 10/- note at election time. And he also knows equally well that the men who organize these associations, who administer their affairs, who distribute the men and assign their localities, are very superior to their brethren, and were never classed, by Mr. LOWE or by any one else, amongst the venal or the drunken; and that it is a pure piece of political spite to level such an imputation at Mr. LOWE. And he perhaps also knows that these men, whose talents and judgment he probably does not much overrate, are at the present moment not excluded from a share of political power; and that, if the franchise were greatly extended, their share would become very large indeed. Whether it would be either wise or just to give an absolute predominance of political power to this class is a question on which Mr. BEESLEY will find that many very liberal politicians have their doubts.

REFORM RUN MAD.

IT was the saying of a sober-minded and distinguished prelate of the last generation, that the study of the Apocalypse either found men mad or left them so. Something of the kind appears to be taking place with regard to this Sisyphean problem of Reform. The predestined and predetermined frenzy of the Beales and Bradlaughs and Company dates evidently from an earlier period than the remotest assignable origin of the present agitation. They were clearly, from all eternity, foredoomed to be vessels of folly, to show the world what nature can do when she resolves to produce the highest type of obstreperous bores. It argues a lack of experience and culture to object seriously to any of the persistent and extensive manifestations of life, whether in the animal, social, or political world. We may rail as we please at blue-bottles or demagogues, but we may depend upon it that, like the poor, we shall always have them. It is harder to find philosophic consolation for the induced madness which the learned Bishop declared could be developed by an appropriate study of the Apocalypse, or, as we think recent evidence tends to show, by an enthusiastic devotion to "the cause of Reform." Reform, beyond all question, is very desirable; and so also, for the matter of that, is a complete and exhaustive exposition of the book of Revelation. But going mad over one or the other can clearly only obstruct the attainment of the wished for result. Why must a sane mind in either case be lost to us, and leave the original task still to be achieved, with all its fascinating allurements to fanaticism or fatuity as attractive as ever?

Probably the last, and certainly the most tragic, instance of such a calamity is afforded by Mr. Frederick Harrison in the current number of the *Fortnightly Review*. Till within a comparatively recent period, few among the rising generation of writers had made a more clear and characteristic mark. Whether you agreed with him or not, it was impossible to read his papers on Trades' Unions, on the limits of Political Economy, and others, without recognising, not only rare qualities of style, but rare elevation of view and generous largeness of feeling. But ardent devotion to "the cause of Reform" has played the deuce with him. From wide he has become narrow, from catholic and generous he has become sectarian and sour, from logical and cogent he has become, incredible as it is, inconsequent and weak. Never was there such a transmutation. He is probably enough far more beautiful, in the eyes of the Titania of democracy, with his present head-gear than ever he was formerly. But this is only a proof of what a questionable advantage it is to win the smiles and admiration of that very skittish fairy.

It is needless to say that the piece opens with an attack on "that man Lowe," as the Reform League notables are fond of calling him. Not so, indeed, Mr. Harrison, who never forgets the *bienséances*, at any rate, with regard to individuals. Mr. Harrison is also aware that pure black, and nothing else, is an insufficient pigment either for portraiture or caricature. With much skill, therefore, he throws in a little white here and there, which not only raises his picture as a work of art, but gives it an infinitely more sinister, as well as a more refined, expression. The first half dozen pages of his article do Mr. Harrison great credit as a master of caustic yet sober invective. We have little or no fault to find with them. Just towards the end perhaps a passing remark reveals some of that savage thin-skinnedness which seems to be an indispensable qualification for graduating high in democracy. "A man who makes himself personally hateful to a nation has but a limited career in a constitutional country;" and we are further told that Mr. Lowe will make himself the *âme damnée* of the House of Commons, and "sink to that unpleasant limbo which is laden with the sighs of men with caustic tongues and ungovernable antipathies." If this really be so, perhaps Mr. Harrison's own future *habitat* may place him in closer neighbourhood to the member for Calne than he would now contemplate with unmixed pleasure. But there it is. You are done for if you make yourself hateful to the nation; and the very simple means of making yourself hateful is merely to have an opinion of your own, and to drop a few sarcastic sentences about certain classes which are never to be either forgotten or forgiven. Such small fry as kings, aristocrats, statesmen, and public men generally are to be abused and vilified, and no notice shall be taken of it; and if the vilified wretches do take notice of it, that

only shows what sordid souls they possess. But woe betide you if you commit the *crimen læsæ majestatis* against the great unwashed. Exile or suicide is then your only alternative. *Verbum sap.*

Mr. Harrison then proceeds to accept Mr. Lowe's challenge, and to deny *in toto* that the House of Commons has a single redeeming feature—that it is worth its salt upon any consideration. The difference between them turns upon a question of fact; their principles appear to be identical. Mr. Harrison scorns equally with Mr. Lowe the doctrine that "a vote is a right"; he holds that "the exercise of political power is a function, not a right—that the beginning and the end of it is good government." Does the House of Commons give us good government? Mr. Lowe says it does; Mr. Harrison says it does not. The first says that, as Governments go, ours is an exceptionally good one; the latter declares that it is the very incarnation of incompetence, lethargy, and stupidity. We are not concerned at the present moment to inquire which view contains most truth, but merely to examine cursorily the facts and arguments which Mr. Harrison adduces in support of his own. It is not for this journal at any rate, as our readers need not be told, to come forward and declare that we have the best of all possible Constitutions, and that our executive and administrative departments are, so to speak, perfect. To find fault is at once the pleasure and the duty of Englishmen, and we are in no wise disposed to concede a monopoly of it to Mr. Harrison. But there is another quality formerly supposed to be peculiarly characteristic of our countrymen, and we fear much that Mr. Harrison does not show such a copious endowment with it as we could wish. That quality is the love and the practice of fair play. Had his indictment run to the effect that in such matters as law reform, pauper administration, army and navy administration, and so forth, much remained to be done, that much was done badly, and that a thoroughly new leaf would have soon to be turned over, he would have had a pretty nearly unanimous audience of the sensible men in the country. But when he says that our legislation "mumbles and fumbles in vain, Session after Session"; "that with the greatest of all tasks before it and the grandest of opportunities it gives us *nothing* but wearisome talk and profitless busy-busy"; when, in a paroxysm of arithmetical invective, he dilates on the last "twenty years of laborious indifference and apathetic commotion, two thousand nights, twenty thousand hours of discourse, bills, resolutions, blue-books, and returns by square miles—and what is the result?—tons upon tons of spoiled paper and the memory of some fluent talk"—he must simply accept the fate as actual and present in his own case which he predicts as in store for Mr. Lowe—that of a "brilliant talker," and nothing more. The fact is that his notions of government are not English, or even constitutional at all, but simply foreign and Cæsarism. He is for ever telling us that Prussia did this and France did that, and some other country did something else, and that we cannot or do not. Could he not, if he tried, tell why? Could he not discover that, among other notable differences between the inhabitants of this island and those of the Continent, one of the most marked is that whereas they delight in nothing more than in seeing their Executive carry matters with a high hand, that is just what we will not endure, what we hate more even than bumbledom and red-tapeism and the Circumlocution Office in all its branches. This is not the place or time to inquire whether we or the Continentals are most in the right on this point. But no one, in England or in any country, can hope to gain weight or influence who ignores the most ingrained and most ineradicable of national characteristics. Mr. Harrison sneeringly remarks, in reference to Mr. Lowe's speeches, that the occasion of their delivery was perhaps the first in our history on which the "House of Commons had stood forth in the new part of the Benevolent Autocrat." The one thing evidently which he longs for is an autocrat—whether benevolent or not, we will not undertake to say. He is filled with fury because certain reforms are not forthwith carried out. Speaking of education, he says, "For a generation Parliament has perorated and procrastinated. It might do so for another generation with as small result. Each fresh scheme is met with the cant of self-government or a shriek of superstition." That is just what it is. Self-government must be swept away. Superstition—that is, the conscientious opinions of people who differ from yourself—must be put down, and your own beautiful autocratic yoke fixed firmly on their necks. This may be the very quintessence of wisdom, but we are quite sure it will cry in vain in our streets.

Having thus settled that the one thing which we are in need of is an autocrat, benevolent or otherwise, Mr. Harrison proceeds to show us how this inestimable consummation may be brought about. He at any rate makes no mystery about his object, or the means to attain it. It is simply to give such an overwhelming preponderance to the working-classes that no will but theirs shall prevail for a moment. Concerning the working-classes Mr. Harrison entertains opinions which, to say the least, are enthusiastic. In them—that is, the working-classes—all excellence, all sincerity abide, and pretty nearly in them only. They are at the zenith, and the cultivated classes at the nadir of human worth. All that is right they wish for, and all that they wish for is right. "They are the brightest powers of sympathy and the readiest powers of action." "They come to the question with open minds." "They would judge of a proposed law by itself, and without originating good laws they would assent to them." "Very plain men," we are told, "know who wish them well, and the sort of thing which will bring them good." It is obviously mere fatuity to be any-

thing but a very plain man after this. It is clear also that, in resisting the rule of universal suffrage, we are resisting the rule of angels unawares. But this is not all. They are the only section of the community who can oppose a successful resistance to the sinister influence exercised by the cultivated classes, "who," we are told, form "perhaps the only class of responsible beings in the community who cannot with safety be entrusted with power." "The man of culture in politics is one of the poorest mortals alive." And the only possible antidote to him and his horrid instincts is to be found in those masses "who are free from the restless egotism which is the curse of all who accumulate wealth, free from the self-indulgent indecision which is the curse of those who live in idleness." He has one simple prescription for all our political ailments. "Let power be taken from those who have it and given to those who have it not." There are plenty of people in this country, it appears, who are quite competent to govern it, "if they only get the motive power behind them." Set them on the Reform Rosinante and they will ride fast and far enough—in what direction we would rather not say. The masses are required "to insist upon the end," and "abundant and capable instruments will be found to effect it." As they alone among mankind are exceptionally privileged to know always "the sort of thing which will bring them good," it is distressing to think that this political millennium cannot begin at once. It also slightly dashes one's tender and tremulous emotions, which are only natural with such a prospect, to be told that "what is wanted in the man who votes is the desire for the right result, freedom from selfish motive, and willingness to trust in wise guidance"; that is to say, that it is only necessary in the masses who vote to be beatified saints for all to go well. Beyond all question the electoral body, be it who or what it may, which always desires the right result, which is free from selfishness, which is willing to be guided by wiser people than itself—if such indeed can possibly exist—will be able to carry very admirable measures. But we should never have thought that such transcendent excellence was surging and seething around us in the masses—that is, in nine men out of every ten one meets in a day's walk.

Such are Mr. Harrison's views concerning the House of Commons, and the appropriate means of making it better. The only test, he tells us, "of a good Reform Bill is this—what result will it have in a division on such critical questions as the transformation of the Irish Church, of Irish landlordism, of the Game-laws, of long entails. No Reform Bill is a Reform Bill unless it would transfer one or two hundred votes from one side to the other in such test questions. To double or treble the existing constituencies, and then to redistribute in a popular spirit about a hundred seats, might do this. But even this would only be effective for a time." The reader notices the mournful sigh with which this quotation concludes. He would never guess what it betokened unless we told him, or read the original for himself. It means that all which has preceded has been a mere sham-fight, and that no King or Kaiser has a more sovereign contempt for representation than Mr. Harrison. It is a solemn absurdity in his opinion, and the "whole conception involves a fallacy at its root." Its chief defect is that it offers an insoluble problem. "Each successive Reform Bill of the season is only another solution of quadrature of the political circle." "And if," says Mr. Harrison, cogently enough, "it is wasting time to discuss theories of representation, it is worse," he argues with great force, "to discuss the petty subtleties of this or that Bill." We are entirely of his way of thinking, but are disposed to complain that he did not enunciate that opinion a little sooner, and that he thought proper to make us read twenty-one pages before he considered us sufficiently prepared to receive it. As it is, we have been laboriously conducted into the most perfect logical *cul de sac* conceivable. The last five pages of his article reader utterly nugatory the first fifteen. He started with dilating on the inestimable benefits which would follow from a very large extension of the franchise—of a franchise which would give all but paramount power to the working-classes, and enable them to counteract the baleful influence of wealth and culture. The wretched creatures who make money, and the selfish wretches who cultivate their minds, would then all be kept in due check by the bright powers of sympathy and the ready powers of action confided to the masses. The reader has seen how they would do all things well—wish right, vote right, and so forth. But now it appears that it really matters very little; that in a country like England "the political form counts for very little, and the social system for very much"; or, as the same sentiment is expressed again a few lines afterwards, "the social system is almost everything, and the political form almost nothing." Under the guidance of this new idea Mr. Harrison discovers that the value of a vote "depends wholly on the state of the political atmosphere. Universal suffrage in an easy time would produce far less visible result than a narrow franchise in an excited one." Nothing can be truer. But does not Mr. Harrison see that he has disposed at one blow of all his laboured impeachment against the House of Commons? It is just because the last twenty years have been perhaps the easiest ever vouchsafed to any nation that political life among us in its more athletic forms has been comparatively uninfrequent. We do not say whether it has been a good or a bad time, but we do say it has been a time when the majority have had little call to think with anything like seriousness concerning the national welfare. Both capitalist and labourer have had plenty to do in looking after their own concerns. The energies of England have been spent in the workshop and the counting-house, and not on the battle-field of

politics. We are not pronouncing an opinion, but simply stating a fact. And we maintain further that all the sluggishness, indecision, and stolidity of the House of Commons have had more than their example and prototype in the country itself. When Mr. Harrison says that the House of Commons suffered Hungary to be crushed by Russia against the protests of the nation, that it rejected Poland, that it half rejected Italy, that it betrayed Denmark, he is simply, we must say it, guilty either of great ignorance or great recklessness. Of course, under the expression the "will of the nation," there may lurk an ambiguity. And Mr. Harrison may only be referring to the heated views of some clique or section which he considers ought to stand for the whole. But, taking the words in their natural sense, we maintain, with little fear of contradiction from moderate men of any party, that Parliament was not a whit more divided and vacillating in its judgment on those topics than the country at large. Of course we know very well that Mr. Harrison thinks that all this selfish indecision as he calls it, but which we prefer to designate by the old-fashioned name of freedom, should be summarily stopped by "the masses," those priceless antidotes to culture and wealth.

YEOMEN.

THE freeholders of Buckinghamshire, and their comparative numbers in the seventeenth and in the nineteenth century, have led to a very pretty quarrel, nothing less than a sort of triangular duel between Mr. Goldwin Smith, Mr. Disraeli, and the *Times*. Now the first two among the disputants are at least intelligible. Mr. Goldwin Smith asked a question of some political and social importance, which has probably been asked by every one who has read with any attention the history of the winter of 1641-2. We there find that there were then 4,000, perhaps 6,000, freeholders in Buckinghamshire, who are spoken of in a way implying that they were men both of independent property and of independent opinions. Mr. Goldwin Smith asks rhetorically where the freeholders of Buckinghamshire are now. Mr. Disraeli, answering the question according to the letter and not according to the spirit, answers that the freeholders of Buckinghamshire are still to be found in Buckinghamshire, and that their number is not any less now than it was in the time of Charles the First. Mr. Goldwin Smith answers in effect that there may be on the register now as many freeholders as there existed then, but that there are not four thousand such freeholders, perhaps not any such freeholders, in Buckinghamshire now as the men who went up to London with the protest against the arrest of the knight of their shire, John Hampden. We do not care to go into the statistics, as we have no doubt that both disputants are in a manner right. All depends upon the sort of freeholders. If Mr. Disraeli could show that he represented not four, but ten thousand squatters, or members of land and building societies, or absentees rich or poor, or holders of freeholds in market-towns, or men dwelling in their own cottages but really living on wages, Mr. Goldwin Smith's general position would not be affected. Whether Mr. Goldwin Smith's Buckinghamshire figures prove his point or not, he could have no difficulty in proving his point in other ways. His general position is one which cannot be denied—that a certain element in English society is dying out, and in many parts of England has wholly died out. The freeholders in the old sense, the men who, without pretending to be gentlemen of coat-armour, had landed estates, greater or smaller, which maintained themselves and their families, were formerly a large and important class. They are now a much smaller and a diminishing class. In many parts of England they hardly exist at all. Where they do exist, they do not keep up their old numbers or their old influence. The fact, thus put, is one which Mr. Disraeli could hardly venture to deny; that he was able to give a captious rhetorical answer to a rhetorical question proves nothing either way.

Time passes so fast, and things get so soon forgotten, that we dare say that the first volume of Lord Macaulay's History is by this time pretty well become a thing of the past. Those who remember it at all will doubtless remember a vivid picture of the seventeenth-century yeoman alongside of the more famous pictures of the squire and the parson of the same age. No doubt the pictures of the squire and the parson were somewhat overcharged. That is to say, there were doubtless some squires and some parsons who answered Lord Macaulay's description, but there were doubtless others who did not. But, as Lord Macaulay describes the three great rural types, the yeoman certainly seems more respectable than either of his neighbours. And we suspect that, if real pedigrees could be got at, the pedigree of the yeoman would often be found to be longer and more really dignified than that of those who were held to be his betters. The class was no doubt a highly respectable and valuable class in England, as it seems always to be wherever it has existed from time immemorial. In France, it seems generally allowed, the system of peasant proprietorship has not as yet worked well. But in France it is comparatively new. It is not indeed so new as people think; the great Revolution did much to forward and extend it; but the great Revolution was by no means its beginning. Still it is not in France the immemorial thing which it is in a large part of Northern Europe. The bonder of Norway overthrew Saint Olaf in the eleventh century, and the bonder of Norway are there still, ready to do the like again, if need be. In England there is no doubt that the class was as old as the English nation, and there can be as little doubt that the Norman Conquest actually

strengthened it, by pushing down many an English Thegn into its ranks. Every one knows that in the Hundred Years' War the existence of an independent yeomanry in England, with its absence in France, was the cause which of all others led to the great successes of Edward and Henry. England, a land of yeomen, had a trustworthy infantry; France, a land only of gentlemen and villains, had none. In Mr. Goldwin Smith's own special period we need hardly say that the Ironsides were freeholders and freeholder's sons. They were the very counterparts of the men who overthrew Olaf at Stikkestad.

How far the name "yeoman" is the proper name of the class may be doubted. As it is now generally used, it means a man who lives by cultivating his own land. He is distinguished alike from the tenant farmer, who lives by cultivating the land of another, and from the landlord, who lives on the rents which the tenant farmer pays him. It is certain, however, that in the sixteenth century the word yeoman was often applied to men who cultivated the lands of others. It is so used both by Bishop Latimer and by Sir Thomas Smith. The really ancient names for the class, *Boor* and *Churl*, have got quite other meanings. The Cumberland name of *statesman* is local, and in most parts of England it would not be understood. An assertion that Buckinghamshire contained 4,000 statesmen might make its representative tremble at the prospect of so many possible rivals. But whatever we call the class, there is no doubt of its existence, its past importance, and its present diminution. How far the loss is to be regretted, how far it can be hindered, are questions which open many considerations which cannot be settled off-hand. There is no doubt a great deal to be said both ways. The scientific agriculturist will probably say one thing; the politician of Mr. Goldwin Smith's views will naturally say another.

As for Mr. Goldwin Smith's antagonist in the *Times*, we are bound to say that, on reading over his article a second time, we found it not to be quite such nonsense as it seemed at first sight. The real meaning of the writer is so obscured by a mass of irrelevant illustration that it is not at first easy to see what he is aiming at, but on a little reflection we find out that his general meaning, though not very profound, is certainly not untrue. It seems to amount to this, that the loss of the yeomanry is owing to natural causes which legislation cannot stop; that, unless men are absolutely prevented from selling their land at all, they will sell it; that the yeomanry are under special temptations to sell theirs, and that it is being everywhere bought up, partly by larger proprietors than themselves, partly by other small proprietors of quite another class. All this is obvious enough. And we think we see glimmerings of another truth—namely, that the law of primogeniture, which Mr. Goldwin Smith dislikes so much, applies to the estate of the yeoman as much as to the estate of the peer, so that, whether it be good or bad, it is not really a law in favour of one particular class. We believe that we are doing the *Times* a service in setting forth what we believe to have been its real meaning on Friday, March 1st. Only the writer thought he was bound to be lively and funny, and so covered up his real meaning with a mass of nonsense. For instance, it seems to be made an accusation against "Mr. Goldwin Smith's freeholders," that they did not pay wages. So far as the freeholder and the freeholder's sons cultivate with their own hands, doubtless they do not. But surely the same law in this respect must apply to the yeoman and to the tenant farmer. The amount of wages that either pays will surely be regulated by the amount of land which he occupies. More oddly still, the yeomen of the seventeenth century are charged, as if with a crime, with "a most decided objection" to paying taxes. Does this mean that Hampden's constituents, like Hampden himself, objected to ship-money, and that this is a sin in the eyes of the *Times*? Then we are told that "the Levitical Law, which allowed no land to be alienated from the descendants of the original owner longer than fifty years," "is the law of primogeniture." Now it is certain that the law of primogeniture does not imply the law of jubilee, neither does the law of jubilee imply the law of primogeniture. A law of primogeniture simply determines how the unentailed estate of an intestate shall pass; it in no way hinders the heir from selling it the day he inherits it. And a law that property should, after fifty years, return to the heirs of the seller would be as well satisfied if the estate were divided among all his descendants then living as if it went to one son or grandson only. Then we hear a great deal about the Buckinghamshire freeholders "walking" to London; it is repeated so often that some point, though we cannot see what, is clearly to be made of their walking rather than riding. But most histories make them ride; it is so in Lingard, who, we presume had some authority for so saying; on turning to Clarendon and Whitelocke—it seemed hardly worth while to hunt up such a point further—we find no distinct statement whether they walked or rode. But, if they walked, those who came from the town and neighbourhood of Buckingham must have been pretty good walkers. But the *Times*' notions about walking seem peculiar. "Sussex, Surrey, Kent, Berks, and Bucks," the whole counties seemingly, are "all within walking distance of the House of Commons." Certainly a walk to Westminster out of some parts of Surrey is easy; out of some parts of Kent it is possible; but how about Sussex, Berks, and Bucks? Is there any part of those counties from which a walk to Westminster would not, to say the least, tire a man? And we really think that a man who walked from Chichester or Faringdon to Westminster would be almost disqualified from even shouting for his favourite statesman when he got there.

The *Times*' article points out, what is perfectly true, that land

is constantly to be sold—that one sort of small estate especially finds ready purchasers. That is what may be called the residential estate, where the house is the primary thing and the land a mere adjunct to the house. Such an estate may be an affair of tens, of hundreds, or of thousands, but in any case the owner does not live on the produce of his estate; he draws from it only a small part of his income, possibly none at all. But the “real freeholder,” in Mr. Goldwin Smith’s sense, whether his estate is a matter of tens, hundreds, or thousands, lives on the produce of his estate. We suspect that the *Times* really meant to draw this distinction—that it meant to point out that, though small estates are constantly bought and sold, yet they are not commonly what we may call yeoman estates, but residential estates. The *Times*, however, was so anxious to quote its own “advertising columns” and to talk of “the gentle, affluent, and enterprising reader” that it seemed at first sight as if it confounded the two classes. In fact, a strictly yeoman estate is not likely to be bought, except for the purpose either of adding it to some greater estate or of turning it into a residential estate. As a rule, people who are not born yeomen do not turn yeomen. We have not as yet any large class of scientific agriculturists buying yeoman estates to practise upon. To rent a larger amount seems commonly to suit them better. As it is, the yeomen are dying out, in influence still more than in numbers. Whether their fall can be hindered or not, whether it is to be regretted or not, the simple fact is undoubted.

WATCH AND WARD AT OXFORD.

A LITTLE squabble which is now going on at Oxford between the University and the town, on the apparently uninteresting subject of the night-police, deserves at any rate a passing notice, as probably the last of the long series of contests about privileges which kindled so fierce an hostility between the civic and academic bodies during four or five centuries. It is amusing to see that the parts of the two combatants are now reversed. The cherished privilege of “watch and ward,” which the University wrested after such bitter struggles from the town, it now desires to restore. The town, on the other hand, equally unmindful of the past, declines to receive it. The truth is that, with the growth of municipal liberties and the extension of the city, the cherished privilege of the University has become a mere burden, and a very costly one; while to the town the long-vexed question of the control of its police has ceased to be a matter of humiliation, and the concession of its opponents presents itself only in the unattractive guise of a threatened increase of its rates.

But the long struggle between the city and University which is thus so oddly brought to mind has more than a mere Oxford interest. It was in fact part of that great struggle for municipal liberty, perhaps the most interesting portion of mediæval history, which has been so elaborately described by writers in Italy and Germany, and which Thierry has sketched picturesquely enough, as far as France is concerned, but which seems to have wholly escaped the notice of English historians. Here, of course, the contest was on a far smaller scale. There was none of that feudal lawlessness to contend against, the contrast with which caused the peculiar brilliancy of the liberties of Florence, or Frankfurt, or Bruges. Indeed the word liberty has to modern ears so much larger and deeper a meaning than it had to the ears of a burgher of the thirteenth century, that we may find it difficult to sympathize with struggles for rights so elementary as the right to trade, the right to justice, the right of self-government. It was, however, for rights such as these that each little township in England, as throughout Europe, had to struggle through long centuries against king, against baron, against abbot, against university. Each right was a “privilege” bought or wrested from grudging lords, each had to be bought or fought for again and again. Even when acquired, they were in constant peril of loss. The rise of a castle, the settlement of a Jewry, the foundation of a religious house, would each bring exemptions or counter-privileges fatal to the freedom so dearly won. Oxford had passed through all these perils before the charter of Richard I. came to consolidate and extend her municipal liberties. The Castle of the Conqueror, the Abbey of Osney founded by its castellans, the Jewry which had sprung up in the midst of the town, had greatly curtailed its independent jurisdiction. Within these narrow bounds, however, the spirit of municipal freedom lived with a life the more intense that it was so closely confined. The city thrived materially, replacing its wooden hovels in 1190 with buildings of stone. Lying, as it did, on the great line of the Thames, it had a traffic of its own; and its boats paid, with no little grumbling, their toll to the Abbot of Abingdon. The charter of the Lion-hearted King, in some sort a child of the city, marks the highest point to which its liberties ever attained. Free from toll and due as the citizens of London, its burghers transacted their own political and judicial affairs in their own Parliament; instead of the one bailiff delegated by the king to collect his dues, they could boast of a mayor of their own election, subject only to the confirmation of the Crown. Whatever may be said of the Angevin kings, they were friends of the towns, and the prodigal sale of charters by Richard ere he started for the Crusade was more than a mere forced result of his royal prodigality. This sudden revelation of a freedom, however narrow in its sphere, which had been quietly won by craftsmen and artisans out of the chaos of the middle ages, was in fact an omen of the Great Charter that was to come. The silent growth of the towns, their sudden advancement of a claim to

liberty in the hour of a king’s need, were but the prelude to that greater claim of a national liberty, advanced in the hour of a king’s yet greater distress, which had sprung naturally out of a people’s growth as silent, yet as certain, as theirs. The University of Oxford, venerable as it deems itself, is four hundred years younger than the town; the Lectures of Vacarius, under Stephen, are the first hint of any instruction given there. Its growth, however, was wonderfully rapid; fifty years later the most famous and learned of the English clergy listened there to the recitation of Giralduus. At the beginning of the thirteenth century Oxford was without a rival in its own country, while in European celebrity it had taken rank with the greater schools of the Western world. It was easy for a burgher, when a baron rode mail-clad through the hovels that clustered round the walls of his fortress, or a lord abbot ambled down the little street to his stately cloister, to foresee the difficulties of the inevitable struggle with feudalism or the Church. It was not so easy for a citizen of Oxford flushed with the pride of his new charter, to believe that a danger to municipal liberties greater than that from abbot or baron lay in the mob of half-starved boys that had poured so suddenly into the midst of the town, and huddled round their teachers in church-porch or house-porch for lack of lecture-rooms. The church of St. Mary gave the first common centre to this mobile crowd; its bell became the tocsin of the scholars; the masters taught in its aisles, or gathered their Convocation in its chapels. The town, on the other hand, fronted this nebulous, incoherent mass of boyish life with an organization as perfect as theirs was incomplete. The church of St. Martin, the centre of its life, rose within sight of the church of St. Mary; the Folkmothe seems to have been held within its walls; under the low shed outside it, mayor and bailiff administered justice; the bell above rang out its answer to the tocsin of the gownsmen. Around, as in some orderly encampment, lay butchery and spicery and vintnery; the trades clustered jealously apart in their narrow streets, but knit together in the bond of the Commune round their mayor as he rode back from the King’s Court at Westminster. Unequal, however, as the contest seemed, a power greater than that of kings lay behind the crude unformed mass of scholars and teachers. The latitude of the mediæval conception of “orders” gathered the whole educated world within the magic pale of the Church, freed them from lay tribunals and lay responsibilities, and subjected them to the control of the Bishop and the Bishops’ Courts alone. The meanest clerk could look to the protection and the thunders of the spiritual arm. The street broil of a few frolicsome boys became an episode in the great struggle between Church and State. The arrest of a disorderly scholar by the town sergeants mounted into a breach of those ecclesiastical liberties for which Anselm had gone into exile and Thomas had died. Ecclesiastical censures against which there was neither appeal nor redress avenged a broken arm or a broken head, nor was it of any great use to pit reason or charters against the ever-ready interdict—against closed churches and silenced bells.

We do not pretend here even to glance at the various occasions of strife or the varying fortunes of the struggle; nor do we at all mean that at the outset (whatever might be the case at a later time) any distinct purpose was entertained by the University of destroying the franchises of the town. But the mere homely questions of food and lodging could not fail to raise difficulties between the two bodies. We can only picture the embarrassments which the sudden influx of scholars brought with it, by conceiving three or four thousand boys pouring nowadays suddenly into the midst of a quiet country town. The price of lodgings and of food would rise to exorbitant rates. The police establishment would prove unequal to the unforeseen strain, and the license of the newcomers would end in perpetual broils. In time these difficulties would no doubt adjust themselves; the school authorities would be glad, for the sake of order, to strengthen the hands of the authorities of the town; the townsmen would weigh wisely their profit from the scholars against their arrogance. But to a peaceful settlement such as this was opposed the whole temper of the middle age—its jealousy of power, its belief in the possibility of settling social and economical questions by sumptuary enactment. The rise of prices seemed, to a scholar of the fourteenth century as to an artisan of this, a mere wrong and extortion to be remedied by the law. The question of police was yet less capable of peaceful settlement, for in it lay the whole question of the immunity of the clerical body from civil jurisdiction. Slowly but steadily the claims of the University advanced, and the yoke of bondage was laid on the town. The burgesses lost their control of their own markets, of their own police. They complained that their houses were scarcely their own, that once used for lodging they could never be resumed into private use, that the rental was assessed for them by an academic board. Their right of justice was practically annihilated; all mixed cases in which a scholar was a party fell within the Chancellor’s jurisdiction, and its privileges were gradually extended to all the large body of servants and scribes who hovered on the skirts of the University. During the reign of Henry III. these aggressions went on with little or no resistance. The great impulse which the Barons’ war gave to freedom aroused in Oxford a fierce attempt through half a century to shake off her yoke. But the efforts of Robert de Welles and John Beresford were less successful than those of De Montfort, and the reign of Edward III. saw the bondage of the town complete. The Reformation, which freed so many boroughs from their ecclesiastical lords, left Oxford unfreed; the Long Parliament was as deaf to its plaint as the Parliament of

the third Edward. It is only by the slow lapse of time, by the changes of society, by the silent revolution which has been effected in our civil and our ecclesiastical polity by the quiet discarding of economic errors, that the chains have one by one dropt away. It is an amusing end to the strife to see the University as eager to part, for the most selfish reasons, from the last badge of its supremacy, as the town is, for reasons as selfish, eager to force her to retain it.

WHO ARE THE LEAGUERS?

IT is not because we attach the least importance to the recent "utterances"—as the phrase is—of the Leaguers, and of Messrs. Beales, Potter, and Bradlaugh, that we advert to their recent seditious language, and to their obstinate and persistent, however petty and contemptible, attempts to defy the law. We speak for another reason. On the one hand, it is satisfactory that the attitude of contemptuous indifference displayed by the working-men towards their miserable would-be leaders, and the failure of the recent vulgar and irritating demonstrations, say something, perhaps much, for their good feeling, and consequently for their worthiness for more extended political franchises. But, on the other hand, so long as the Leaguers are permitted, even by sufferance, to stand as the representatives of the unenfranchised masses, their cause is seriously injured. Justly or not, the working-man will be judged by the Bradlaughs and Potters. Nothing tends so much and so fatally to point the sarcasms and to intensify the suspicions urged against those who are about to be entrusted with new political responsibilities, as the conduct of the demagogues who claim to be the organs of Reform as understood by those most interested in it. The working-man will be judged, or misjudged, by his champions. It may be quite true to urge that the frothy nonsense and impotent treason which is spouted by these people defeats itself; that it is too absurd and ridiculous to be worthy of serious argument; and that even to refer to it is only giving it a substantial importance which it would never acquire otherwise. But the present state of things must be dealt with. It is to the interest, in the first place, of the working-men themselves to disavow these mannikin tribunes of the people. It can never, in a country like this, answer for any political party—and the *ouvrier* interest is about to become a political and Parliamentary interest—to be represented by a small atheist lecturer like Mr. Bradlaugh, or by such spokesmen as the orators of the Adelphi Terrace and the Fleet Street public-house frequented by the adventurers who, in the name of Trades' Unions, are doing their best to annihilate trade itself. And further, though the nocturnal meetings which take place in Trafalgar Square are utterly contemptible, it is high time they were ended. They are avowedly, ostentatiously, and defiantly illegal. The present Government has not too much dignity to rely upon, but law cannot afford to be defied by even the most insignificant of traitors. And the language held, and the contempt of Parliament flaunted, by these wretched agitators is such that it involves not only an insult to the Constitution, but remains a spectacle disgraceful to civilization itself.

It is not from the meagre reports of the Leaguers' language which finds its way into the more respectable of the daily newspapers, that these men are to be judged. We must turn to their own organs for a full knowledge both of the men and of their avowed sentiments. About a fortnight ago Mr. George Potter's Association discussed the question of holding meetings in Trafalgar Square for the avowed purpose of "fighting, not the Government alone, but the House of Commons itself," unless the People's Reform—that is, manhood suffrage and the ballot—were conceded. It was admitted that meetings held to pass resolutions within a mile of Westminster Hall would be illegal, but there was no necessity to pass resolutions. The door of evasion being prudently left open, the delegates postponed the question of the Trafalgar Square meetings. Whether it was that this comparatively temperate resolution on Mr. Potter's part exasperated the Leaguers—that is, the Beales camarilla—we are not able to say; but it is significant that, at the re-election of the Executive of the League which took place the next evening, Mr. Potter was rejected, only obtaining thirty-three votes, while the first three names on the list were those of Langley with sixty-four, Rogers with fifty-nine, and Bradlaugh with fifty-four votes. The new Executive lost no time in assuming what they call vigorous action. At the meeting of February 27, Mr. Beales, President of the League, delivered himself thus:—"He could not exclude or excuse the Liberal party from the charge of insulting the working-man . . . It was not merely the Tory Government against which they had to fight; they had to struggle against the House itself . . . It appeared as if those who denied them their rights would not be content unless the working-classes had recourse to means which he did not wish them to have recourse to." Following speakers were not so chary, and seemed to find no difficulty in recommending the course from which the mild President affected to shrink. Mr. Mackey said, "If the people were driven into rebellion the fault would be with those who blindly and persistently refused to concede their just rights." Mr. C. Bradlaugh remarked "that the people would have to do something more than march in procession. He was one of those who thought the sooner bad laws were broken, the better for the people. . . Suppose Lord Derby told them that the next meeting they proposed to hold was illegal, what were they to do then? For his part, he would not hold back

because Lord Derby told him he ought to. . . He did not intend to have his head knocked in by a policeman's truncheon. If the policemen interfered with the people's political duties, they became the transgressors, and the people had a right to remove them." Colonel Dickson "endorsed every word that Mr. Bradlaugh said." Mr. Lucraft announced "meetings to be held in Trafalgar Square on Saturday evening next and on Monday evening next, and every succeeding Monday." A proposition was then made "that all London Reformers meet every Sunday for the purpose of recreating (laughter), at three o'clock in the afternoon;" but on this resolution an amendment was carried, "that the Reformers of London do meet in Hyde Park on Good Friday for the purposes of recreation." A special meeting for Monday the 11th of March, in Trafalgar Square, was ordered to be summoned by the Executive of the League. The evening's entertainment was wound up by Mr. Cremer carrying a resolution—"That unless a satisfactory prospect is held out in Parliament of the working-classes being universally enfranchised upon the principles of the League, it will be necessary to consider the propriety of those classes adopting a universal cessation from labour until their political rights are conceded." Upon all this the *Beehive* remarks, in what it is pleased to call "a voice of thunder"—rather melodramatic thunder though—that they "WILL HAVE IT, COME WHAT MAY (*sic*). The middle-class must be told that, unless they make common cause with the toiling millions of their countrymen, they will be made uneasy and uncomfortable daily and nightly by Reform demonstrations and meetings." Mr. Bradlaugh ("Iconoclast") cock-a-whoop on his election on the Executive of the League, crowed very significantly in his own atheistic journal, the *National Reformer*, and not unreasonably identified the League with his own sentiments, which he took occasion to announce in very intelligible terms. We quote his language from the *National Reformer* of March 3:—

Last week we announced, believing it to be the fact, that we were no longer on the Executive. This week we have only to state that we were re-elected by five-sixths of those present at Wednesday's general meeting, despite our declaration to the assembled Council that events were possible which would necessitate holding meetings under conditions forbidden by Act of Parliament; and that we, having determined, if needful, to resist the Government decision as to Hyde Park, did not desire to remain on the Executive of a body whom we might injure by a policy too advanced. We thank the delegates who elected us for votes which we take to mean declarations in favour of our policy. We shall have no more weary and costly processions; we shall have cheaper and more menacing meetings within a mile of the Houses of Parliament.

And in another place the Editor of the *National Reformer* announces, not very logically, but with sufficient candour:—

If the Government do not take a satisfactory course on Reform, it will be undoubtedly the right and duty of the people to take such action as shall prevent the continuance of the present House of Commons.

These "more menacing meetings" are now in progress. It will, however, be necessary to distinguish between them. A meeting was held on Saturday in Trafalgar Square; but this was a Potter meeting, convened by the Working Men's Association, and a comparatively mild affair. As we have pointed out, there are different elements at work. Bradlaugh avows himself an atheist, and glories in his atheism; the newspaper which he edits, under the name of "Iconoclast," proclaims on its front Atheism, Democracy, and Malthusianism. Potter is a very religious person; he takes counsel with the Dean of Westminster on the best means of getting the people to church and meeting, and he has his views, as on things profane, so on matters divine. His policy is to get the Almighty on the side of manhood suffrage, or at any rate to make the churches of London too hot for the ordinary pew-holders. The ingenuity and religiousness of his policy are instructive. In his Saturday night's speech he "would suggest a week's cessation from business on the part of the working-men. They must walk the streets of the metropolis day after day, and stop all the traffic, interrupt all the business for a week, and become a public nuisance. If all the working-men were in the same mind as himself, they would very soon become a public nuisance. (Laughter and cheers)." "He should also propose that one day of the week should be set apart for humiliation. (Laughter.) He would ask the working-men of this great city to go with him to St. Paul's, Westminster Abbey, and other churches, to pray that a great national calamity might be averted. (Renewed laughter.)" On the whole, the bold outspoken blasphemy of the atheist is not a great deal more offensive than the fun of this religious jokester.

On Monday last the first out-door meeting of the League was held under Mr. Bradlaugh's presidency; and a lamentable and ridiculous failure it was. The League finds it convenient to disavow this meeting; but the extracts which we have given from their own published proceedings show that it was first announced at the meeting of the League Council on February the 27th, by Mr. Lucraft himself, a member of the Council, and therefore it is impossible to separate the League from complicity in it. This meeting was only remarkable for another bit of bounce on Mr. Bradlaugh's part, that "he was ready to march the people down to the very doors of St. Stephen's"—a valorous sentiment, which was cheered by the small boys, and was safe enough, seeing that there were no people to march, and the meeting adjourned because there was nobody present to continue even the sham of a representative assembly. It is satisfactory, as we have already remarked, to note the failure of this wretched and miserable agitation. Perhaps Mr. Walpole is right in permitting these tongue-valiant Gracchuses to show how

impotent they are to influence the working-men of London. But this contemptuous permission to such men as Bradlaugh to hurl childish defiance at the law has its dangers. In 1843 the Cochrane and Reynoldses of the hour were just as ridiculous and just as contemptible, and their agitation was quite as ineffectual. Still they were put down, not only by authority, but with public assent. But Feargus O'Connor, and Mansel Reynolds, and Cochrane were by comparison respectable, and even had claims to influence which it is ridiculous to compare with those presented by such a person as this Bradlaugh. It is an insult to the working-men of England to identify them with the "Iconoclast" of the *National Reformer*. But we almost question whether Beales M.A. is quite aware of what his colleague on the Executive of the Reform League is. At any rate, however disgusting and offensive the revelation, it is just as well that public attention should be drawn to the avowed and boastful principles of this prominent and active member of the League Council—of that very body, be it remembered, of which Bradlaugh, perhaps not unjustifiably, claims the confidence. We take up—and the process almost requires the old ceremonial expiation of the Jews to go out of the camp and to remain unclean till the evening—the "*National Reformer*," edited by Iconoclast," i.e. Mr. Charles Bradlaugh. The recent numbers of this "*Secular Advocate and Free-thought Journal*" have been engaged in reprinting the "*Papers of a Suicide*," which originally appeared in the *Reader*, and the publication of which brought that journal to sudden death. But this "essay" is mild to the ordinary blasphemies of the *National Reformer*. We pass over such trifles as a eulogistic biography of Giordano Bruno, and proceed to what is of more importance, the speculations admitted into that journal. In the number for February 24 one correspondent announces "from a medical point of view that the Saviour was a Jewish peasant of low birth, labouring under a maniacal delusion, and talking in a state of mental inebriety." In the number for March 3, Mr. J. P. Adams applauds those "who reject Christianity from a conscientious conviction that as a system it violates truth, reason, and experience"; and, addressing Mr. George Potter, reminds him "that the religion he professes should rather bear the name of the gospel of damnation than that of salvation." We almost doubt whether we are justified in quoting from the number for February 17, what purports to be a "fable for the wise, the *Fanatical Monkeys*," originally written by Charles Southwell, and now reproduced from memory by J. P. A.—the aforesaid Mr. J. P. Adams, we suppose. This "fable" is not inserted in that department of the *National Reformer* for which the Editor disclaims the responsibility:—

There is a great big monkey sitting upstairs in the clouds; and he has his all-seeing eye upon you; and oh! brethren, mind the whisk of his long tail. An old monkey of our tribe saw it once; it had three ends and only one top, and the stump was like three and the ends were one. And this almighty monkey, who made everything out of nothing before there was anything, had a whelp or cub, which never was born, &c.

But we must stop. It is superfluous to express our indignation at the man who can be guilty of publishing this atrocious blasphemy. We admit that the profession of Christianity is not necessary for canvassing political subjects. But in a political writer, a "journalist," as this Bradlaugh styles himself, we demand some character. Even Atheism can be advocated, and Christianity written against, with decency. But such filthy ribaldry as we have from a sense of duty picked off Bradlaugh's dunghill is simply revolting, odious, and nauseating to the natural sense of shame possessed by a savage. It is worth the careful consideration not only of the Reform League itself—of which there must be many members not dead to all common decency—but of the working-men generally, to say nothing of others, to judge what manner of man it is who stands so high in the confidence of the League, in the person of "Charles Bradlaugh, Journalist, the *Iconoclast* (and Editor) of the *National Reformer*," the mounted marshal of the League procession, and member of the Executive Council of the League.

THE EXTENSION OF THE FACTORY ACTS.

WHEN a plainly wise and serviceable thing is once done, the whole world is full of astonishment that it was not done ever so long ago. We may experience something similar in private conduct. Some step from which we have been shrinking for months or years is no sooner taken than we are lost in amazement at our own indolence or cowardice in standing back so long. The history of most wise public measures is just the same. Until they are passed and adopted they seem absolutely impracticable; every difficulty magnifies itself a thousandfold, and every advantage seems trebly problematical. The great Factory Acts were an admirable example of this. All sorts of cries were raised against them, and it was perhaps owing to a happy political accident that they were passed at all. The extension of this excellent piece of legislation over a wider field has been plainly seen to be both logically necessary and to be eminently desirable practically. But the world is slow to admit logical necessities, and not much less slow to open its eyes to what is practically desirable, unless the shoe pinches that part of the world which happens to have influence. The only trades to which the provisions of the original Factory Acts were applicable were the manufactures of cotton and woollen cloths. In these great branches of industry the mischiefs which came from the policy of

laissez faire were on a proportionately large scale. A cotton-mill in which many hundreds of men, women, and children were employed, was big enough to exhibit the evils on a scale sufficiently considerable to be visible to the most indifferent onlooker. Its ventilation was grossly imperfect at the best, and in most cases there was no ventilation at all except such as might come from the casual opening of a door. Dangerous machines were left unfenced, with constant damage to the limbs and lives of the workers. Provisions for even a moderate amount of decency and cleanliness were wholly absent. Hours were mercilessly long. Children were made to bring some little addition to the family stock, at the cost of an early death, or a stunted and dwarfed life. Education was left to chance, with a result similar to that which we may see in the agricultural districts at this day. Anybody who wishes to estimate the results of the factory legislation should visit a cotton-mill in Lancashire, or a woollen-mill in the West Riding of the neighbouring county, and get to know something of the details which fall within the province of the Government Factory Inspector. In the matter of hours, even as it is, everybody knows that the Inspector cannot by any means dispense with vigilant surveillance. Another way of estimating the value of this legislation would be either to observe, or else to study the Commission Reports upon, those branches of production to which the provisions of the original Acts were not extended. We should then find abundant ground for wonder that it had been reserved for Mr. Walpole, in 1867, to carry out what nobody who gave half a disinterested thought to the matter could fail to see the urgent necessity of. The Reports showed that a host of other trades were quite as thickly sown with anti-social practices as the cotton and woollen manufactories had been; and measures have already been taken in accordance with these Reports, in the Bleaching and Dyeing Acts, the Lace Factories Acts, and Acts affecting six minor trades, such as fustian cutting, lucifer-match making, and so on.

The two Bills explained by Mr. Walpole at the end of last week are developments of the same principle, though with one or two novelties which will create an unpleasant flutter in the bosoms of those who think that to allow everybody to do just as he likes is the whole law and gospel of political economy. No children or women whatever are to be employed in night-work, as a general rule. In special trades, where such work is inevitable, young persons may be so employed, but only upon very strictly defined conditions. If they work at night, then they must not work either in the day-time before or in the day-time after. And they may not work for more than a certain number of successive nights. Again, in the grinding trades, at present, if a grinder wishes to live more than the average forty years of his business, he must generally pay for his own fan to drive away the dust that flies from the stone and metal. Mr. Walpole insists that in every case a fan shall be provided with the stone. All provisions of this sort are thoroughly defensible, even on the grounds taken by the very narrowest and least intelligent of political economists. Where a portion of the community is, either from insensibility or other reasons, incapable of knowing its own interests, or of protecting them even if it does know them, then clearly it is the function of the State to intervene and protect their interests. In truth, the interference of Government at present would be less needed in the case of the cotton and woollen cloth trades than in any other, because in these the power of combination among the workmen is much stronger than in the minor trades. Their numbers, their local concentration, their close intercourse with one another, make spinners and weavers best able, of all operatives, to enforce whatever regulations their own comfort may demand. Of course Government interference is useful or indispensable even here, for the reason that it fixes and maintains a standard which the unaided ideas of the workers would be much longer in arriving at. And in the great question of the employment of children, the workers in these large trades are not even now to be quite trusted. The factory doctor is said to be obliged to keep his eyes open to prevent the employment of children under the legal age. And it is in reference to the employment of children that public opinion is, on the whole, weakest in checking the selfishness of parents. It is here that public opinion, and not among the working-classes only, stands in most need of education. The pestilent notion that a man has a right to do what he likes with his own exerts its most disastrous influence in this sphere. If a man does what he likes with his own in the case of land or shop-fronts, or consuming his own smoke, at the worst he only breeds a more or less transient kind of nuisance; but the application of the doctrine to children ensures indefinite misery to generations yet to come. It is therefore with the utmost satisfaction that all enlightened persons will learn that Mr. Walpole proposes to introduce supervision even into manufactures conducted in private houses, and where the children of the master are habitually employed. A mere glance at the Report of the Commissioners upon the trades contemplated in Mr. Walpole's Second Bill—establishments in which less than one hundred persons are employed, such as lace manufactories and wearing-apparel trades—will convince anybody with a convincing mind that the Home Secretary was right in declaring the evils incident to them to be greater than those existing in trades already subjected to inspection. He added that "these evils are aggravated to a tenfold degree in the small workshops where the children of the employer are found at work." This is sure to be the case. A man's power over the children of other people, however great a tyrant he may be, and however

slavish they may be, is still limited to a certain extent. But he may do pretty nearly anything by his own children, short of putting them to a sudden and violent death. It is not merely that the law is chary of interfering between father and child. Public opinion itself, as we have said, is shamefully lax on the conduct proper to this relation. Mr. Mill, here as in many other all-important points, has a much keener and truer eye than the ordinary half-educated political economist. "Freedom of contract," as he truly says, "in the case of children, is but another word for freedom of coercion." "Parental power is as susceptible of abuse as any other power, and is, as a matter of fact, constantly abused." In the interval that will elapse before Mr. Walpole's Bill becomes law, no doubt people with sinister interests will raise the old cry that you are fettering trade and limiting the power of contract; with the still more plausible alarm superadded that you are setting the child against the father, and the father therefore against the child. It may be worth while, in anticipation of this outcry, to ponder the words in which the member for Westminster has put the general theory:—"Whatever it can be clearly seen that parents ought to do or forbear in the interest of children, the law is warranted, if it is able, in compelling to be done or forborne, and is generally bound to do so."

We may be allowed to hope that Mr. Walpole's Bill is only an instalment of measures which the next generation will find springing out of this unanswerable doctrine. Mr. Walpole himself, whom nobody will accuse of violently revolutionary tendencies, declared it to be the first duty of a parent to see that his child is physically, mentally, and morally educated, in order properly to fulfil the various duties of life; and, what was still more to the point, "if that duty is neglected, we must come to the State, the parent of the country, to fill the place of the parent of the child." This, as the dullest of mortals may perceive, is getting very far ahead. Admit the force and width of the analogy between the "parent of the country" and the parent of the individual, and you will be landed on strange shores, where Mr. Walpole would not by any means find himself comfortable. At all events, he could not oppose that measure which we are told is to be the first-fruits of the *régime* of the working classes—compulsory national education. Meanwhile, let us be grateful to him for what he proposes to do in the matters already under his hand. No children under eight years of age are to be employed in workshops, and children between eight and thirteen are only to work for certain hours. This is something, though we look in vain for that education which, according to the Secretary's own admission, "the parent of the country" would be justified in requiring and enforcing, and which both Mr. Bruce and Mr. Edmund Potter, who followed him in the debate, joined in imploring. From what the Home Secretary said in answer to this complaint, we may perhaps hope that the opportunity will even yet not be lost, and that, after all, there may be a clause more or less directly making attendance at school for certain hours every day an indispensable condition, both before and during the age of permitted employment. It is a great comfort, as it is, to think that any parent who contravenes the law in the case of his children and in his own manufactory will have to pay a fine for his misconduct, if the local authorities can find him out. A penalty is to be imposed "both on the employer and upon the person who, whether parent or not, directly profits by the labour of the children." We wonder by the way, whether Mr. Gathorne Hardy, as he sat listening to the exposition of his colleague's Bill, reflected how much of it was due to "sensation articles." In his sense, indeed, the Bill is a "sensation" Bill. That is, it is very humane, earnest, and opportune.

RUSSIA AND BOKHARA.

THE Russian *Invalid* a short time ago thought fit to deny the news received from India, that Djuzak, in Bokhara, had been captured by the Russian troops. Lately, says that official organ, there has been no fresh intelligence from Turkestan, so that the Indian newspapers are at fault. It is nevertheless true that Djuzak was captured by the Russians so far back as the end of October last, and telegraphic intelligence to that effect was transmitted to this country from St. Petersburg in November. What the Indian newspapers have lately reported may possibly be considered rather stale in St. Petersburg, but the fact could not well have reached us sooner by way of India. For some time no doubt the Russian press has been silent in regard to Turkestan, leaving us to infer that since last November there has been nothing doing—that, in short, the quarrel with Bokhara has been hushed up, and no more news is to be expected. But, as we shall see, there is good reason to believe that important movements may be in progress, of which we shall hear nothing till the Russian Government is able to communicate some decisive success.

The movement which resulted in the capture of Djuzak is itself a good illustration of the policy of silence which the Russian Government practises as to affairs in Turkestan until some *fait accompli* has to be announced. The pretence is continually kept up that an aggressive course is contrary to Imperial policy; each step in the progress of conquest is concealed to the last, and then all sorts of explanations are put forward to account for the temporary departure from the avowed policy. It will be remembered that the result of last summer's campaign was the ejection of the Bokharians from the valley of the Syr-Daria. As the result of the battle of Irdjar, and the capture of Nau and Khodjent, the Emir of Bokhara not

only had his army destroyed, but he was completely cut off from the territory in the State of Kokan—or the upper part of the Syr-Daria valley—to which he had pretensions. The Russians simultaneously obtained the return of the envoys whose detention was the alleged cause of their hostilities against the Emir, and they gave out that peace was likely to ensue. They might indeed have been satisfied. They had not only avenged their retreat from Djuzak in the spring of the year, and released their envoys, but they had acquired most valuable territory in the valley of the Syr-Daria, which had now become a Russian river from its sources to its mouth in the Sea of Aral. It was untrue, however, that peace was likely. The Russians had claims to make on the Emir of Bokhara which prevented the conclusion of peace, and these claims were being urged at the time it was given out in Europe that the war was over. The Russian official organs now assert vaguely that war continued because the Bokharians still wished to make good their claims to Kokan territory, but it is hardly consistent with a desire on the part of the Russians to stand on the defensive that the next movement should have been an invasion of the State of Bokhara itself. Good care, besides, has been taken to say nothing of the exact terms on which they would have been willing to make peace. When so much is said of the really peaceful intentions of Russia in those regions, in spite of appearances to the contrary, it is well to bear in mind what the "appearances to the contrary" really are.

So far from remaining on the defensive, the Russian General—for the first time in these operations in Turkestan, the Governor-General of the province in person—took the field, in the beginning of October, with the largest force which Russia has yet employed in that quarter. He had under him 19½ companies of infantry, 5 sotnias of Cossacks, 24 guns, and 4 mortars, besides rockets and an engineer corps. His object, as it afterwards appeared, was to pass the range of mountains, running east and west, which interpose between Bokhara and an invader coming from Kokan. This done, he would find himself in the upper valley of the Zer-afshan, with the whole valley of that river, which flows in a westerly direction parallel to the protecting mountain range, at his mercy. In other words, he would be able to strike at once at the heart of the State, which really consists of the Zer-afshan valley, including the cities of Samarcand and Bokhara; the remainder of the State farther south in the valley of the Shehr-i-Sebz, or along the banks of the Amu-Daria, being of less consequence. The mountain range has for centuries been the scene of conflicts between the shifting sovereigns of Kokan and Bokhara, and the first obstacle of the Russian General was the oft-contested fortress of Ora-tepe, lying a few miles only from the Syr-Daria, at the base of the northern slopes of the mountains, and on the direct road from Khodjent to Samarcand. The reason why General Tcherniaieff failed in the spring was, no doubt, his having advanced by a more westerly road, disregarding Ora-tepe, as well as Nau and Khodjent, on the flank of his line of march. Thus moving, he was literally in the air, and with a more skilful enemy than the Bokharians his retreat would have been infallibly cut off. Ora-tepe appears to have been more strongly fortified than any fortress which the Russians had yet encountered in Turkestan, and it was strongly garrisoned, though the Russian accounts do not give the numbers of the garrison. After careful reconnaissances, and a bombardment for a few days, an assault was given on the 14th of October, and the place carried in spite of an obstinate defence. The Russians acknowledge very severe losses. Two of the assaulting columns, numbering together 500 men, lost respectively 77 and 74 men in killed and wounded. Altogether the number of killed and wounded was 227. On the other hand, the slaughter of the enemy was great, and the trophies abundant. No less than 2,000 bodies of the enemy's dead were buried in the days succeeding the siege, and it may be noted that, although the retreat of the garrison was cut off, no mention is made of prisoners. The prize of war which fell to the victors included 4 standards and 32 pieces of artillery, besides a great quantity of muskets, and vast stores of powder and other ammunition. The impulse of this success carried the Russians to Djuzak, about fifty miles distant on the southern slope of the mountains, and little more than thirty miles north-east of Samarcand. No resistance was offered at Djuzak or Zamin, both places on the road through the mountains which have been the scene of combats in former wars. Djuzak was also found strongly fortified, being, in fact, the place where General Tcherniaieff was checked a few months before. The details of its capture are not before us, but, according to the telegraphic despatch, it fell after an operation which must have been very similar to the affair at Ora-tepe. The siege lasted five days, at the end of which period a successful assault was delivered. Only a small part of the garrison, we are told, escaped, the majority having been killed or taken prisoners. The prize consisted of 26 standards, 53 pieces of cannon, and a great quantity of rich booty. The Russian losses acknowledged are 100 killed and wounded. This affair at Djuzak has been described as the capture of the last stronghold of Bokhara in the valley of the Syr-Daria, but it is apparent, from the description we have given, that such an account falls short of the mark. Djuzak is not in the valley of the Syr-Daria at all, but many miles on the farther slope of a mountain ridge south of that river. The expression should have been, the capture of the last stronghold of Bokhara against an invader coming from Kokan. Its fall leaves nothing between the Russians and the country they have invaded. Samarcand is but a few miles off, and from Samarcand

to Bokhara along the course of the Zer-Affshan is a less distance than what the Russians have traversed from Khodjent to Samarcand, while the road is infinitely more easy. At this stage news has ceased. Last November an obscure telegram from Orenburg affirmed that the war with the Emir was over, that commercial relations had been re-established, and that the Russian troops were returning to their cantonments; but, although there has been ample time, no confirmation of the news has yet come. It is just possible that the Russians may be content in the meantime with the advantages they have gained; but they have still demands which the Emir refuses, and there is no report of the signature of peace. Instead of having agreed to terms and submitted, the Bokharians have despatched an embassy to India, soliciting aid in their defence. It would be no matter of surprise to learn at any moment that Samarcand and Bokhara have fallen as rapidly as Ora-tepe and Djuzak were captured last October.

Such being the actual position of affairs between Russia and Bokhara, it will be obvious that on some points an article which appeared in the last number of the *Edinburgh Review* on the foreign policy of Sir John Lawrence, and which has excited attention on account of its semi-official character, must have been written under a misapprehension of the facts. All through the non-aggressive intentions of the Russian Government are assumed, and the activity manifested on the frontier is ascribed to the restlessness of the generals. In particular, it is stated that last spring the Governor-General of Orenburg, General Krishanoffski, as well as General Tcherniaieff, had been recalled from his command, because the Government were determined to pursue a less ambitious policy. The fact is, that whatever may have been the case with General Tcherniaieff, whose alleged "recall" is spoken of in the Russian official press as a twelvemonth's furlough on account of his health, General Krishanoffski has not been recalled. As we have seen, he was in command at Ora-tepe and Djuzak, the most important operations which yet have taken place in Turkestan; and shortly before he had presided at the formal annexation of Tashkent and Khodjent, by special commission from the Emperor. This is the very opposite of Imperial displeasure at an ambitious policy. The reviewer, however, appears to have been unaware of the events we have described, although they were reported by telegraph last November. This is unfortunate, as these events completely negative his assumption that the next measures of Russia would not be directed against Bokhara, but rather towards rounding off the Russian frontier among the sources of the Syr-Daria. It is probable that the latter business has not been left undone, but neither have measures been wanting against Bokhara. Another assumption is that the Russians will eventually retire to Tashkent, annexing only a small portion of territory near that city; but this also is negated by the actual annexation of the Khodjent district, and the probability that Ora-tepe and Djuzak have been permanently occupied.

The statements most relied upon in regard to the intentions of the Russian Government being thus erroneous, much of the speculation which has been based on them calls for reconsideration. It is indeed inconceivable that the important cities, and the thousands of miles of rich territory, which Russia has acquired within the last few years were annexed reluctantly. As we have frequently shown, there were several stages at which it would have been possible to stop. On the principles declared when the first bit of Kokan was annexed, there was never any valid reason for capturing Tashkent, and yet the Russians have for some time been in force two hundred miles south of that point. At the same rate of advance, the Russian outposts will be on the Amu-Daria before the close of the present year, and the probabilities are that no great slackening in the rate of progress will take place. Of course we do not pretend to foretell the future, but, judging from the past, the possibility of Russia having such designs is not to be lightly put aside. There remains the further question, which is necessarily very obscure, what may be the ultimate aim of Russia in these persistent aggressions? We are told that much alarm, at which we do not wonder, is felt in India. The persistency with which a great military Power is approximating its frontier to ours is perhaps more embarrassing than the mere fact of approximation would be in itself. But that fact, whatever the motive of Russia, must be productive of embarrassment enough. The strength which Russia may soon be able to bring to bear on the North-western frontier of India is very much under-estimated. Already at Djuzak, the Russians are nearer to Herat, the "key of India," than Herat is to any point of the Indian frontier; and with their outposts, as they soon will be, on the Amu-Daria, they would find the possessors of the intervening country intractable enough to furnish ample pretexts for approaching and occupying that famous city. This is not a remote contingency, but an event which is likely enough to happen within the next two years. No one would deny the gravity of such an occurrence, but it is perhaps little thought that the use which Russia could make of such a point to invade or "observe" India will only be limited by the means she can dispose of for a great European war. The Volga and the Caspian, on which there is a numerous fleet of merchant steamers, offer an uninterrupted communication from the heart of Russia to the Persian province of Mazanderan, from which, across the plain of Khorassan to Herat, the country is every way suited for the march of armies. In a year or two, when the railways are completed from the South of Russia to the Volga, the gradual transport of an immense army to Herat will be a comparatively easy matter. On what part of her European frontier would

Russia have greater facilities for collecting an army? We are told that it will be impossible for Russia to "reach Herat in any appreciable strength without the active assistance of Persia"; but the fact is that Russia is strong enough neither to care for Persian assistance nor for any obstacles which Persia could interpose. What resistance could Persia, which was worsted forty years ago by a small army communicating with its base in Russia only by the difficult Caucasus, offer to the huge levies which at pleasure could now be sent into the field? No one denies the obstacles which a Russian army having its base at Herat would encounter on the march to India; but do those who praise a policy of "masterly inaction" reckon on the strength to which we must raise our army in India when Russian armies have Herat to start from? Altogether, it is not certain that the offensive-defensive would not be in this, as in many other instances, the cheapest and easiest means of obviating danger. By advancing to Herat ourselves, we should not only prevent Russia from combining her lines of operation from the Caspian, and through Bokhara and Kokan, but it would also be in our power, should the occasion arise, to send an army to the Caspian, debarring Russia from a footing on its southern shore. This would be less costly than to allow her quietly to become established as our neighbour, and then be forced to arm on an enormous scale, like the jealous military Powers of Europe. The cost of the Afghan war is alleged as a reason for doing nothing; but that war was grossly mismanaged, and it was undertaken at a time when our frontier was remote from the scene of operations. An expedition in that quarter would now be a much simpler affair, and Afghanistan is rich enough to support the garrisons which would be needful to hold it. The question is one which must very soon be formally considered. We have thought it worth while for many years to enforce on the Persians the obligation not to capture Herat, apprehensive that it might be used against us by virtue of Russian influence over Persia. Notwithstanding all the reassuring articles which have been written of late, it can scarcely be doubted that, when the Russians themselves threaten, the present hollow confidence in their peaceful intentions will vanish, and the occupation of Herat will be prevented even at the cost of war. It might perhaps be wiser to take time by the forelock, and avoid the risk of war by forestalling Russia.

THE SUNDAY LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

THE curiously composed meeting which assembled in the Guildhall on Monday was in pursuit of an indisputably good object. Archbishop Manning and Mr. Newman Hall are doubtless equally convinced that drunkenness is a very bad thing, and ought to be put down; and if any one will show us the way to put it down we will certainly not ask whether he is a Roman Catholic, or a Dissenter, or an infidel. Moreover, the blessing conferred would be so great that we would not pause to look too scrupulously at the means. Whoever talked about the British workman's "constitutional right to get drunk," as quoted by Dr. Manning, was, if serious, talking nonsense. At least, the fact that such a right exists, can be no reason for not taking the right away as soon as possible. Neither that rather vague entity, the British Constitution, nor the still vaguer body of *a priori* rights invoked by metaphysicians, should be regarded with superstitious reverence in the case of such a plain practical benefit. If there is a short cut to general sobriety, if drunkenness can really be abolished by an Act of Parliament, we should be strongly tempted to allow *a priori* principles to take care of themselves; and, in the case of such an enemy to the human race, to hang first and try afterwards. The precedent of such an interference with private liberty might indeed be awkward in certain cases; but the benefit would be so very plain in this instance as to justify an exceptional proceeding. If, therefore, we have a doubt of the wisdom of a policy with such attractions as to bring Mr. Newman Hall upon the same platform as Dr. Manning, it is not because we doubt either the goodness of the object or the lawfulness of the means. We only doubt whether an Act of Parliament is so omnipotent in practice as it necessarily is in law. It is so very tempting and simple a mode of reforming an evil to make a law that it shall not exist in future, that reformers often forget to ask whether any Parliamentary sanction can be sufficient; they seem to think that legislation acts by some direct and mysterious virtue, instead of merely setting in motion a cumbrous and often very inefficient machinery. Now the legislation proposed in this case would undoubtedly produce some very serious collateral evils, which we must deduct from the prospective advantages; and we must, therefore, look all the more closely into the question of its efficiency. We do not feel certain that it would diminish drunkenness, and there can be no doubt that it would produce a very bitter, and not altogether ill-founded, discontent. The question is whether it is worth while to encounter such a positive evil for the sake of a problematical benefit.

The meeting, indeed, seems to have provided examples of this objection. Of course such a meeting, however open theoretically, is chiefly attended by the zealots. The ardent teetotallers assemble to preach, and the mass of their opponents do not come to be preached at. Consequently, the minority out of doors has a large majority within. There was, however, a small body of persons who, as they expressed it, "liked their beer," and who raised a feeble protestation against the

general current of opinion. Now a liking for beer in moderation is a harmless, if not a laudable, peculiarity. Moreover, the only day on which a working-man can enjoy his beer, as beer deserves to be enjoyed, in peace and quiet, is of course Sunday, which, unluckily, is the day when a man has just received his weekly wages. We do not wonder, therefore, that one of the speakers declared an attempted interference with his beer to be a "tyrannical and Puritanical" invasion of his rights. Dr. Manning not unnaturally repudiated the epithet of Puritanical; but, as he immediately proceeded to quote the authority of the New England States, it seems that, on the present occasion only, he was in strict truth adopting a Puritanical principle. The Maine Liquor Act and the Forbes Mackenzie Act, both of tolerably unmistakable origin, were the models of legislation which he held up for imitation. The more important epithet, however, is "tyrannical," and, whether justifiable or not, it contains the pith of the argument. The effect of the proposed legislation is to treat the working-classes as children, who cannot safely be trusted near temptation. This may be the fact, but is not the less irritating. The rich man might still have his wine at home or at his club; the tradesman might booze quietly in his parlour; the only class who would feel the law at all are the poor, whose only amusement is the change from miserable lodgings to the comparative comfort of a public-house. It is not in human nature that a law bearing so hardly and so exclusively upon the lowest class should not produce great bitterness. If it were possible to pass an Act shutting up the clubs of the wealthier classes as grave causes of scandal, we should hear philosophy enough about the tyranny of the majority; and the fact that the proposed change would be in the interest of the working-classes themselves would not prevent their drawing the inference that a minority can also be tyrannical. For, after all, the public-house represents more to the poor man than the club to the rich, and in some degree owing to the same agitators who now wish to close the public-houses. They are shocked at any plan for providing intellectual entertainment on a Sunday; they effectually prevent the opening of museums or picture-galleries; they think it very questionable whether people should be allowed to stroll in botanical gardens; they wish to stop all traffic by trains or steamboats; they even object—although they do not propose, so far as we have yet heard, to enforce their objection by law—to a man taking a quiet walk on a Sunday. In short, they wish, in the first place, to confine our three millions as closely as possible to the dingy streets and alleys in which they are compelled to pass the week; then they refuse to allow them any kind of entertainment, from theatres down to public gardens; and now they propose, by way of clinching the system, to shut up the public-houses. After stopping every possible avenue of escape, they probably cherish the hope that their victims may at last be persuaded to bolt, in despair, into some sort of chapel. If indeed it were possible rigidly to proscribe every imaginable form of amusement, perhaps people who preferred thinking about nothing in company to thinking about it alone might be worried into a little more church-going; but it seems rather an undignified mode of recommending church-going when "ministers of all denominations" combine to pray that the general level of dulness may be lowered by law even beyond the pitch of dulness to be found in their ministrations. Such a policy, whether right or not, could hardly be enforced even in a modified degree without producing a powerful sense of class injustice; for however philosophical we may be, we all feel very keenly grievances which immediately affect our stomachs, and to rob a poor man of his beer may make him angrier than to do a good deal of injury to his political rights.

It follows, however, still more obviously that the law would be inefficient than that it would be invidious. It is difficult to imagine a greater temptation to every variety of smuggling and evasion than it would present in London. A whole nation of thirsty spirit-drinkers are to be shut up in this wilderness of houses without any source of amusement except an occasional attendance upon church, and with abundant supplies of alcohol locked up in every street. If some sort of underground route were not discovered by which the alcohol might somehow quench the thirst, publicans and drunkards must be much less acute than usual. Before a year was over we might predict that it would be almost as easy to get drunk in London on Sunday as it was before, except that the liquor would doubtless be more poisonous and more expensive. The additional risk would have to be covered in some way; but the gravitation of potent spirits towards the human throat, even though it had to circulate by imperceptible and circuitous channels, would probably be as marked as the parallel tendency of coin to transfer itself during election time from the pockets of the candidate to those of the electors. The liquid would be conveyed to the other side of the legislative barriers by a mysterious process resembling the exosmose of chemists. The proposal would of course then be made to enforce a still more stringent code of legislation, and we should soon have to embark upon a complete crusade against the production and consumption of spirituous liquors in general. This might no doubt be practicable, as almost anything might be practicable, if we could only obtain sufficient zeal to work it. A sufficiently ardent persecution would put down Protestantism, or freethinking, or, for that matter, the practice of reading and writing. Only there are two difficulties to be considered by practical men—first, that you cannot, in such cases, get sufficient zeal to supply you with the necessary working power, and the more strin-

gent the restrictions, the more difficult is it to get the zeal; secondly, that if drinking were put down, we should have put down a harmless pleasure as well as a vice. We have not so many pleasures in this life that we can afford to abandon one for fear of its abuse. This consummation is too remote to be worth discussing; but then it is scarcely worth while to enter upon a course which, if it stops short of that consummation, is likely to do as much harm as good, and to encourage smuggling instead of crushing the trade.

Meanwhile, such agitation as that at the Mansion House is likely to do some good. We may be called too cynical for doubting the efficacy of the legislation proposed. Perhaps it is being too enthusiastic to believe in the efficacy of preaching. Yet, after all, a great moral reform is more likely to be effected by making the working-classes sensible of their vices than by legislating against them. Dr. Manning quoted cases where the proposed reform had been effected by voluntary action in two of the Irish dioceses, where it was enforced "by moral suasion only." The circumstances are of course very different, but the precedent seems to point in the right direction; for a gradual rise in the popular tone would bring about the same improvement that has been carried out in the higher classes, and enable us to hope for moderation, instead of an impracticable attempt at total prohibition. The agitation may incidentally help on other desirable objects, such as a change in the time of paying wages, which are now so naturally impelled towards the public-house; but, if the agitators had their way, we should fear a very sensible addition of social tyranny.

PICTURES OF THE YEAR.

IV.

THE Winter Exhibitions in Paris are not numerous, but there is one, of a semi-private character, which repays a visit. The Fine Arts Club, the "Cercle de l'Union Artistique," holds an exhibition in its own rooms, 12 Rue de Choiseul, from the 4th of February to the 18th of March. Admission is gratuitous, but a ticket is asked for, which must be signed by some member of the Club. Amongst the exhibitors this year are Bellay, Boulanger, Breton, Henriette Browne, Puvion de Chavannes, Corot, Daubigny, Dawzats, Diaz, Jules Didier, Gustave Doré, Jules Dupré, Fromentin, Gérôme, Hébert, Paul Huet, Jalabert, Manet, Masure, Palizzi, Pasini, Protais, Philippe and Théodore Rousseau, Schreyer, Tissot, Otto Weber, and William Wyld. The Exhibition is exactly of the kind most favourable to enjoyment, being small in size and of a high average quality, whilst the system of admission guards against overcrowding. The more important of the two Gérômes, the "Marché aux Esclaves," is not a new work, and certainly not an attractive one. In some Oriental slave-market a beautiful girl is standing, quite naked, whilst a possible purchaser is examining her teeth. The incident is a revolting one, but was probably chosen on account of the opportunity it afforded for the contrast between the severe beauty of the nude and the picturesque Oriental surroundings. The central figure would have been far less striking, and even less beautiful, if those around her had been naked also, and conceived poetically; but they are heavily clothed, and, so far from having any tenderness or poetry in their aspect, are simple men of business. We may observe, with reference to the way Gérôme designs the nude, that it is the nearest approach to realism which any thoroughly refined draughtsman has yet made. His women are real women, not reminiscences of Greek statues; and yet they have neither the coarse realism of Courbet, nor the hard accuracy of the photograph. The colour of this work is a good instance of Gérôme's qualities and limitations. The slave-merchant's dress is carefully and even well coloured, but the prevalent hue of the picture resembles clay or mud. The types of character are, as usual, admirable—a swaggering fellow, with big pistols in his belt, being the most amusing. Another capital bit of character is a single figure of a youth in a smaller picture, entitled "Relais de Chiens au Desert." He is holding a leash of greyhounds in the desert. The landscape is dreary in the extreme—nothing but sand, a great ugly sand-hill coming just behind the figure. The youth is healthy and strong, and quite ready for sport; he stands firm, his short blue dress blown by the wind. The dogs, like all Gérôme's dogs, are marvellous, so finely and delicately drawn.

Amongst the more important works in Mr. Wallis's Exhibition in Suffolk Street is the "Return of Columbus," by Mr. E. Long; but, although evidently a serious and laborious attempt, we cannot consider it a successful picture. The colour of Gérôme is not worth much, because he can only colour isolated passages; but that of Mr. Long has the even graver fault of a fatiguing and vulgar glare. There is, however, much robust and manly painting in this work, and vigorous life in the personages represented. The following quotation from Washington Irving's *Life of Columbus* is given in the Catalogue:—

The fame of his discovery had resounded throughout the nation, and wherever he passed, the country poured forth its inhabitants who lined the road and thronged the villages. The streets, windows, and balconies of the towns were filled with eager spectators who rent the air with exclamations. His journey was continually impeded by the multitude pressing to gain a sight of him and of the Indians, who were regarded with as much astonishment as if they had been natives of another planet.

In Mr. Long's picture, Columbus is entering some Spanish town, and the Indians precede him on a car drawn by oxen. These

Indians are very uncouth and curious figures, and they have some cockatoos with them which astonish the Spaniards very much. The heads of the oxen which draw the car are painted with great skill, and there is an effective head of a mule. Columbus is not so near to us as the Indians, who rather interfere with him. He is mounted on a grey horse, and carries his hat in his hand. Awnings are spread above the picturesque street. There is a bit of intensely blue Spanish sky above, and we see a belfry tower and a tiled roof, and a picturesque agglomeration of buildings. The costumes of the people have afforded only too favourable an opportunity for the display of gaudy colours for which Mr. Long appears to have an unfortunate predilection.

Mr. D. W. Wynfield has two pictures in the French Gallery which seem to deserve notice. One is entitled

"No joy to her the blooming season brings,"

and represents an evening effect with a young lady leaning sadly on the rail of a low bridge, absorbed in meditations which do not appear to be of a cheerful kind. There is some poetry in the work, and the painting is more than respectable. It is easy to select an evening effect, which is always more likely to seem poetical than one of simple daylight, and it is as easy to choose a melancholy young lady as a cheerful one, so that there is nothing in the invention of this motive to imply superior powers, but the sentiment here is genuine and the painting sound. The other picture, "Fast Ripening," by the same artist, though quite as well painted, and indeed in some measure better suited to the display of technical skill, displeases us by triviality of idea and awkward eccentricity of arrangement. A young lady is gathering, or touching, some fruit which is fast ripening on the branches that hang over a garden walk. Her feet are hidden in the leafy beds of a kitchen-garden, and the wall is close behind her. What we dislike here is the trivial idea of "fast ripening" as applied equally to the young lady and the fruit, and also the bad management which makes her look like a trespasser walking where she ought not to be. If a due respect for garden beds did not restrain the lady, respect for artistic exigencies might at least have restrained the artist. The painting is technically very good, the leafage is really fine, and this makes us the more regret that it should have been thrown away on a subject of no interest.

Mr. G. A. Storey exhibits in the same gallery a picture called "The Breakfast," which is by far the most agreeable work we ever saw of his. It is truly delightful. In some old country-house four children are getting their breakfast on a high wooden bench under a mullioned window, and before a long oak table. A lady is attending to them, and the little people are busy with their spoons, each having his basin. As the bench is high, their feet are of course far above the ground, and the artist has carefully marked the various attitudes of the restless little legs. Nor are the faces of the children less varied and characteristic. The perfect keeping and nice painting of the whole interior have pleased us very much; it is equal in simplicity and taste, and scarcely inferior in execution, to the similar subjects of the best contemporary Frenchmen. The subject might easily have been treated in the vulgar domestic manner, that most detestable product of English philoprogenitiveness and bad taste. Mr. Storey has steered clear of this danger, and has given us a work which, whilst it is sure to please all who love good children, is not likely to offend the few who require good art.

Mr. Marcus Stone returns to the inexhaustible Civil War. We have had Royalists in many situations, and here are "Royalists seeking refuge in the house of a Puritan." Incidents of this kind, and pictures of this quality, are so common in modern Exhibitions that we feel the greatest difficulty in getting up any interest in the subject. The picture will interest some one, however, when it gets out of the distracting neighbourhood of the canvasses hung round it in the Exhibition. It may hang, some day, in a remote country-house; and a boy fresh from Walter Scott, sure to be an ardent and uncompromising Royalist, will admire that brave gentleman who stands near the door with his hand on his sword and a red feather in his hat, and tenderly sympathize with the lady who is begging the hospitality that these dull Puritans begrudge. For that boy the picture will be full of interest and enjoyment; the old woman furbishing the Puritan helmet, the clever, distinct painting of pot and table, all will have a charm for him which has long since lost itself for us. Nothing is less interesting to persons very familiar with artistic production than the regular costume picture, and it requires the very highest powers, or extraordinary interest in the subject, to overcome the indifference we excusably feel towards models in dresses of the time of Cromwell or Elizabeth. If it were not for the extreme rarity of good military pictures, we might have better hopes for such a work as Mr. Jones Barker's "Dawn of Victory," in the British Institution. Lord Clyde is on his white horse in the front, and his staff is grouped behind him. As it is very early in the morning, we have a dark landscape, a star in the sky and dark clouds overhead, with a deep blue distance, whilst the figures are relieved by very bright torches which we find it rather difficult to account for satisfactorily. There is the usual terrible accompaniment of corpses, never more terrible than at the dawn, which does not rouse them. The picture is certainly impressive, and of true historical interest; but though the workmanship is skilful, the effect is dubious, and inclines to a specious brilliance.

We envy the pleasure of those who, entirely unacquainted with Mr. G. R. Boulanger's illustrations of Algerian life, first make his acquaintance in so charming a performance as his "Paternal

Education," in Mr. Wallis's Gallery. A man is riding on a white mare, which has just forded a stream. The mare is just putting her foot on the sandy shore, and behind the cavalier is seated a little child, whose short legs have no hold on the animal. A negro is walking behind, in the water. The three figures are very admirable, but the horse is even more admirable still. The movement was by no means an easy one to render, for the mare is gathering herself for the little scramble on the steep bank; but it is entirely successful. The landscape is agreeable though not obtrusive, and the grey sky leaves room for vigorous relief in the white figure of the mare.

Mr. George Leslie, whose "Clarissa" in last year's Academy gave him a higher position than any he had previously reached, has not contributed anything of equal importance to the winter Exhibitions. In the French Gallery, a young lady in a state of disappointment bears the title "Hope Deferred." The figure is painted with Mr. Leslie's usual good taste, and so is the simple furniture behind her; but the warm colouring of the wall is rather a doubtful experiment, and strikes the eye unpleasantly at first. It is wrong, however, to discourage experiments of this kind, because they often lead to valuable discoveries in colour; and the harmonies of mixed tints are so far from being easily exhausted that every colourist who has attained a distinctive place has done so by the discovery of relations before unsuspected. Whatever may be thought of the colour of this picture, we decidedly prefer it to the same artist's attempt in water-colour in the Dudley Gallery, called "A Little Bit of Scandal." A lady is sitting, so far as the spectator is concerned, alone, though it is to be supposed that some other person, most probably of the same sex, is sharing the morsel of scandal with her. The costume of course refers us to the last century, when scandal is supposed to have been more plentiful than it is in the present enlightened age of massive public interests. The subject is trivial and trite to the last degree, but it might have been illustrated with art of sufficient technical quality to command respectful attention. Mr. George Leslie, though not without skill as an oil-painter, is by no means a master of water-colour; his manner is timid and weak, he dares not leave an unstippled wash anywhere, and, though he rightly abstains from the too common practice of imitating oil, he does not, on the other hand, know enough of the resources of pure water-colour to make the best of that medium. It was right, no doubt, to try water-colour; it is an agreeable relief from the more tedious work of an oil-painter, and always affords great facilities for study; indeed, every oil-painter ought to be able to use water-colour as an auxiliary art. But it does not follow that an oil-painter should risk reputation already in some degree achieved by the public exhibition of his attempts in water-colour. There is really no comparison between such work as that in the "Clarissa" and the girlish finish of this "Scandal."

Miss Adelaide Claxton, having succeeded in astonishing us with her remarkable ghosts last year, somewhat imprudently attempts to renew the sensation now. It is the misfortune of painters, as it is that of public writers, that they cannot safely subside into the easy reproduction of exactly similar things, as merchants and manufacturers do. It is true that much of the art we see in the Exhibitions is little else than a reproduction, under new forms, of ideas already perfectly familiar to us as the limited stock-in-trade of the artists; but although there may be a steady demand for a certain quantity of ghosts, Miss Claxton must resign herself, if she goes on in the same line, to something like neglect on the part of the critics, simply because they will be able to find nothing new or interesting to say about her. Here a little child is creeping down a haunted stair, in an old house, in a gleam of brilliant moonlight. A door is ajar, showing a woman sitting asleep in warm light, and the child has taken the opportunity for making a little nocturnal ramble. On the staircase, however, it meets some highly-transparent and very polite ghosts, in a costume fashionable a hundred years ago. Miss Claxton's ability in this peculiar line is indisputable, and though her ghosts are quite gay and lively, besides being unquestionably *comme il faut*, they are as much to be feared on old staircases as the sheeted wraiths of a Scottish border tower. What strikes us as curious is that we have here not only the ghost of a man, but that of a lace cravat, and a long coat, and a pair of breeches. It is consolatory to know that the dead find ample wardrobes in the region of shadows as unsubstantial as themselves, but not the less adapted to their wants.

From cold ghosts on a moonlit staircase to hot healthy lads under a haycock in full sunshine, is a brusque but not disagreeable transition. Mr. James Hayllar, whose facile brush has already made itself known in clever costume pictures, has this year become passionately interested in hay-making. We cannot congratulate him on the result of this new taste of his, for although exhibiting artists often make hay metaphorically whilst the sun shines, the sort of haymaking which rustics accomplish is not very favourable to the production of fine pictures, especially if the scene of it is laid in England. The glare of the full sunshine, the awkward forms of the haycocks, and the too intense freshness of the shorn grass make a hay harvest difficult to treat. Mr. Hayllar, in his "Under the Haycock, Fast Asleep," has managed the subject as badly as he possibly could have done. First, there is a total absence of composition. The haycock is planted in the very middle of the picture, which it almost entirely occupies. Beyond it is that most unpicturesque of all habitations, a modern gentleman's house, as stiff and ugly as may be. There is some clever painting of angular lights on clothing, but a want of gradation. The sky

is feeble and the foreground null. An awkward rake is introduced, and even the shaded side of the haystack is without richness or depth of tone.

MONDAY POPULAR CONCERTS.

THE Monday Popular Concerts are more than ever in vogue, which, bearing in mind the excellence of their object, and the admirable efficiency of the performances, is not surprising. At no former period has the director, Mr. S. Arthur Chappell, been so successful in imparting variety as well as interest to his entertainments. From the commencement of the present series his principal quartet of "strings" has been complete at all points. Though neither Herr Straus nor Herr Wilhemj, who successively held the post of leader previous to Christmas, can be justly compared with Herr Joachim, they are at all events players of the first rank, and much better able to replace Herr Joachim than any other known violoncellist is to replace Signor Piatti. The engagement of Signor Piatti, as violoncello for all the concerts morning and evening, was a step the wisdom of which cannot be called in question. This artist is alone a pillar of strength; and a Joachim, however welcome, is not wholly indispensable, where there is such solid support for any really competent first fiddle who may turn up. But it is not enough in a quartet that the top and bottom should be right. The "middles"—second violin and alto—are of equal importance to the design of the work and its fair appreciation. And here in both instances Mr. Chappell is fortunate. Herr L. Ries has played "second," with few intermissions, since the Monday Popular Concerts were started (in 1859); while the part of alto, for years sustained with ability by the late Mr. Henry Webb, is now permanently confided to Mr. H. Blagrove, who, like Herr Joachim, M. Viouxtemps, and other eminent violinists, is a thorough master of the viola. The quartet-playing has, indeed, been singularly fine, a result quite as much due to the fact of the second violin, alto, and violoncello continually practising together as to the talent of those upon whom at various intervals has developed the appointment of leader.

Since Herr Joachim's return the concerts in St. James's Hall have been more than usually brilliant. It is needless to recapitulate the sterling qualities of this great and popular artist. He affords us no chance of criticism; to play indifferently on any occasion, or, in fact, to play other than his best, being seemingly not in his nature. What that best is, every amateur knows, and we refrain from any new attempt at describing it. One or two remarks, however, may not be out of place. It appears to us that Herr Joachim is playing with more enthusiasm now than at any former time. This may be mere fancy, but such was our impression on the night of his first appearance—an impression confirmed by every subsequent performance. It was a sign of implicit faith on the part of Herr Joachim in his public to make his earliest appeal with the enormously long, enormously abstruse and intricate quartet of Beethoven (in B flat, Op. 131), the third of the five which have till very recently passed under the name of "Posthumous Quartets," though all had received the last touches and were in the hands of the publisher before the composer's death. But that Herr Joachim's confidence was not ill-placed, the religious attention given to the work throughout, and the flattering applause bestowed upon each movement, especially upon the *adagio* in E flat, the most expressive, melodious, and beautiful of them all, sufficiently proved. The splendid vigour of his *allegro* and *presto* playing are surpassed, if possible, by the depth, the subtle gradations of tone, the satisfying wholeness with which he interprets the bearing and sentiment of such movements. Of this we have recently had many examples, and among them pre-eminently the *adagio* in question, the *andante con moto* in the third of the Rasoumowsky quartets, the *adagio* of Mendelssohn's No. 5 (Op. 44), and that of his quintet in B flat, the *adagio ma non troppo* of Mozart's incomparable quintet in G minor, and some of the simpler but not less engaging slow movements of Haydn. Then the finesse and genuine humour that invariably mark his reading of a *scherzo* could hardly have been exhibited to more absolute perfection than in the *scherzo* of Mendelssohn's already named fifth quartet, perhaps the most piquant and individual of the large family of *scherzi* that sprang from the fanciful brain of its composer. Lastly, what nobler example of "bravura" could be cited than Herr Joachim's execution (at the last concert) of Bach's *Chaconne*, with its interminable but ever increasingly interesting variations? A world of expression forces its way through the extraordinary difficulties of this unique composition, which Herr Joachim delights to play, and his admirers to hear him play. Each variation is endowed by him with a distinctly-marked character, and yet the whole sounds just the same like one well-balanced piece. All these things, and many more which we cannot stop to mention, have been brought forward since the advent of this greatest of musical Hungarians, the living and potent antidote to another musical Hungarian (Franz Liszt), who, while not less gifted, has worked as zealously against as Herr Joachim on behalf of the true interests of art.

Next perhaps in immediate importance to the engagement of Herr Joachim has been that of Madame Schumann, the pianist. Madame Schumann seems to be playing better this year than two years since, when she was last among us. While none of the vigour, occasionally excessive, of her play has abated, we think her execution generally has gained a measure of that refinement and repose in which it was previously more or less deficient. That

she should especially excel in the music of her late husband, Robert Schumann, is quite natural; and this makes us regret the more that she should have only given us, in the way of solos, specimens of his bagatelles and *jeux d'esprit*, such as the *Arabesques*, *Kreiseriana*, and *Stücke im Volkston*, which, as Schumann was markedly deficient in humour, are not to be ranked among his happiest productions. One of the two pianoforte sonatas, whatever opinions may be entertained of their intrinsic worth, would have at least excited more serious attention. Nevertheless, Madame Schumann throws a charm over these somewhat artificially elaborated trifles that there is no resisting. To pass from small matters to great: at another concert she gave with Herr Joachim, &c., Schumann's quintet in E flat, for pianoforte and string instruments, her performance of the chief part in which was full of genuine enthusiasm. Indeed, enthusiasm, we wholly agree, is apparent in whatever this lady undertakes. True, at times her enthusiasm runs away with her—as in parts of the great sonata of Beethoven, Op. 53 (the "Waldstein"), in the last movement of the same composer's D minor, Op. 31, and in the whole of his E flat, Op. 27 (companion to the "Moonlight"), with her reading of no single movement in which can we entirely sympathize, any more than with the time in which she conceives the *adagio* of the D minor sonata, making it not so much *adagio* as *andante*, and scarcely even *andante*. But, on the other hand, it as often serves her in good stead, and carries her safely to the end—as, to name a remarkable instance, in the *Thirty-two Variations* (again Beethoven) on an *Original Theme*. Hitherto Madame Schumann's performances at the Monday Popular Concerts have been beyond compare in the music of Schumann, here and there, as we have suggested, open to question in that of other composers, but never uninteresting, because always stamped with the impress of unmistakable originality. On the whole, we prefer her playing in concerted music—as, for example, the great E flat trio (Op. 70), and the sonata in G (Op. 96), of Beethoven (the first with Herr Joachim and Signor Piatti, the last with Herr Joachim). Her reading and execution in these, as in her husband's quintet, are beyond criticism. That Madame Schumann's engagement is acceptable to the frequenters of St. James's Hall, is shown in the warmth with which she is invariably greeted, and the applause bestowed indiscriminately on her every effort. We have perhaps heard more uniformly finished playing, but certainly never more uniformly loud applause. Herr Joachim himself, on Madame Schumann's days and nights, is comparatively thrown into the shade.

The other pianists have been Herr Pauer, Mr. C. Hallé, and Madame Arabella Goddard. Herr Pauer, at the last concert, introduced the F sharp minor *fantasia* of Mendelssohn, the *presto-finale* of which, though as *presto* as possible, was not altogether as clear as possible. Mr. Hallé has played often, and even more than usually well. Madame Goddard has played seldom, but never better than in the *Sonata Appassionata* of Beethoven. By the way, she is about to introduce, for the first time at the Monday Popular Concerts, the longest and most difficult sonata of the same composer (Op. 106, in B flat), a venture the boldness of which at least merits recognition. It is to this that Mendelssohn playfully refers in a letter to his sister Rebecca, dated *Frankfort, March 25th, 1845*:—"I came with S— last night from a punch party, where I first played Beethoven's sonata, 106, in B flat, and then drank 212 glasses of punch, *fortissimo*!" Madame Goddard, M. Hallé, and Herr Pauer have all joined Herr Joachim in pianoforte duets, trios, quartets, or quintets—rarely the least interesting features of the evening.

To speak in detail of the various pieces that have already been included in the present series of concerts, or even to give a bare catalogue of them, would exceed our limits. Some few of the least familiar, however, demand a passing notice. No. 5 of Mozart's six quartets dedicated to Haydn (in A), as melodious as any, and as ingenious as most of them, has been heard for the first time; equally so the ninth and last of the quintets for string instruments by the same composer (in E flat), to which precisely the same criticism may apply. Beethoven's *Thirty-two Variations in C minor upon an Original Theme* (played with much spirit by Madame Schumann) were also a novelty, but are not likely to remain long unfamiliar, if other pianists are now and then allowed a choice. We are further indebted to Madame Schumann for the reintroduction of the charming trio in A, for piano and strings, called (why?) "Chamber Trio," by Dr. Sterndale Bennett, who unhappily gives us but rare specimens of such music now. We have had both of Schubert's pianoforte trios, about one of which (in B flat) Robert Schumann wrote, rhapsodically:—"One glance at this trio and all the pitiful clouds of life disperse, and the world shines out again as fresh and bright as ever"; and about the other (in E flat):—"It made its appearance like a fiery messenger from the skies, and scattered all the petty musical troubles of the day"; besides the quintet in A for pianoforte and strings, and the ottet in F, for string and wind instruments. The more of Schubert the better. The two trios, moreover, were his swan's song, for he died very shortly after the first was published (1828), in his thirty-second year.* If not one of the greatest of masters, Schubert was one of the greatest geniuses the art has known, one of the sweetest and most inexhaustible of melodists, and one, as his songs alone would show, able to enter into every phase of human feeling and make it his own in music. In another sense it

* The other did not appear till ten years later.

is good that, while full play is being allowed to Schumann, full play should also be allowed to Schubert. We have little doubt about the man who must ultimately gain the day and keep his hold on the affections of the world. Of Schumann there has been enough; for, to the quintet and the smaller pieces already cited, the quartet in F (the last of three dedicated to Mendelssohn) and the pianoforte trio in D minor must be added. These doubtless have merit—but how different from Schubert; how laboured where Schubert is easy and graceful, how barren of melody where Schubert is most melodious, how pretentious where Schubert is unaffectedly free! Let us, however, by all means be thoroughly initiated in Schumann; but until we know the whole of the Schumann secret and are converted and Schumannized, it is unfair to assail us with the music of Schumann's disciples. The introduction of a sextet in B flat by Johannes Brahms, the young musician after Schumann's own heart, the future poet, "at whose cradle the graces and heroes kept guard," who was a master before he knew he was a man, and about whom all sorts of great things were prophesied, is one of the few mistakes with which Mr. Chappell can fairly be charged during the entire course of his very successful administration. Herr Brahms is about the dimmest of new lights we can call to mind.

The vocal music has been much of the same character as usual. We have had new songs by Messrs. Benedict, Henry Smart, A. S. Sullivan, and Macfarren, all more or less good, and excellent singing by Miss Louisa Pyne, Miss Banks, Mr. Sims Reeves, Mr. Santley, and Miss Edith Wynne, the last named of whom is making head rapidly, and we may add legitimately. Mr. Benedict is still accompanist.

REVIEWS.

LOCKE ON TOLERATION.*

IF we measure the importance of a book by the degree in which it expressed the feeling of the time in which it was written upon a subject of the greatest moment, few works will be entitled to a higher position than Locke's famous *Letters on Toleration*. The first Letter—for there are four in all—contains what has become in the present day the orthodox faith on the subject. There is hardly a line of the argumentative part of it which would not still express, as concisely and systematically as it is possible to express them, the popular views of the matter. Indeed, if an abstract of it were republished without saying where it came from—in some provincial newspaper, for instance—no one would think that it was anything else than a summary of what the editor himself, and all his predecessors for generations before him, had been continually saying on the same topic. This, in a sense, is high praise, for it is not every one who is able so exactly to hit the popular feeling of his own and of subsequent ages as to succeed in writing what will serve many generations as a commonplace. On the other hand, it is difficult not to feel that commonplaces are commonplaces even if they do last for a couple of centuries, and that there is something not altogether creditable to the reputation of a philosopher in the fact that he succeeded in inventing and perpetuating such commonplaces. These considerations give a good deal of interest to Locke's *Letters on Toleration*; but behind them lie the questions, Are they true? Do they really settle the question which they discuss as fully as, from their success, they would appear at first sight to have settled it?

With respect to the Letters themselves, we doubt whether many people in the present day read them, and we could not conscientiously advise any one to take the trouble of doing so who had not some special reason for examining Locke's writings. The first Letter is short, and comparatively interesting, but the second is longer; the third is terribly long, filling three hundred octavo pages; and the fourth, which is fragmentary, and is not published in the folio editions of Locke, is a continuation of the third Letter after an interval of twelve years, and was left by the author in an incomplete state. Moreover, the second and third Letters belong to one of the dreariest of all departments of literature. They are answers written in the old controversial style to an antagonist who, to judge from the quotations which Locke gives from his letters, was not in the least degree worth answering. The unfortunate author in question appears to have been of opinion that persecution was a very bad thing, but that "moderate penal laws" with "convenient penalties" were highly useful, not as punishments to men for not believing in the true religion, but as practical inducements to them to give a full consideration to its precepts and doctrines, the end of which would of course be that they would embrace it. It was easy enough for Locke to show that a person who held such a view as this occupied a contemptible position; but, to tell the truth, his triumph becomes after a time exceedingly monotonous, and the eternal jangle of "I did not say what you say that I said," and "If you mean this, then I say that, but if you mean that, then I say this," becomes after a while insufferably tiresome. Controversial pitched battles are, as a rule, terribly dull and uninteresting reading when they are in the least degree personal. The attack and defence of a doctrine which has sufficient interest and plausibility to be worthy of a full statement and an artistic demolition is often interesting; but a personal dispute about the merits of a particular book or pamphlet is, of all forms of literature, the most repulsive. There is hardly

a redeeming passage in the third Letter on Toleration. It is all skimming and refutation from beginning to end; the subject itself is lost sight of in the continual confusion of quotations and dissections of quotations.

The first of the three Letters is the really interesting part of the work, and it is worth while to give some account of its principal points, because there can be no better text for an inquiry into one of the most curious and instructive of all political problems, practical or theoretical. Toleration, Locke tells us, he regards as "the chief characteristic mark of the true Church." He says that he cannot believe that those who are careless of their own salvation should care for the salvation of others, and that it is impossible to think that those who "persecute, torment, destroy, and kill other men upon pretence of religion," "do it out of friendship and kindness towards them"; or that men who do not punish immorality, which is beyond all question opposed to every view of religious belief, are actuated by a pure regard for religious belief when they do their best to extirpate particular sects. Such being the general spirit in which he is disposed to regard persecution, Locke proceeds to justify his aversion to it by laying down the theory by which it is, in his view, condemned. He does this very shortly and distinctly, and in a manner which, as we have already observed, settled the commonplaces on the subject effectually for a long time:—

I esteem it [he says] above all things necessary to distinguish exactly the business of civil government from that of religion, and to settle the just bounds that lie between the one and the other. . . . The commonwealth seems to me to be a society of men constituted only for the procuring, preserving, and advancing their own civil interests. Civil interests I call life, liberty, health, and indolency of body; and the possession of outward things, such as money, lands, houses, furniture, and the like.

The power of the civil magistrate "neither can nor ought in any manner to be extended to the salvation of souls," for three reasons:—First, because the care of souls is "not committed to the civil magistrate any more than to other men." It is not committed to him either by God or by the social contract. Secondly, "The care of souls cannot belong to the civil magistrate because his power consists only in outward force; but true and saving religion consists in the inward persuasion of the mind, without which nothing can be acceptable to God." Thirdly, magistrates differ, and, "there being but one truth, one way to heaven, what hope is there that more men would be led into it if they had no rule but the religion of the Court."

The magistrate therefore cannot lawfully persecute; but can the Church do so? "A Church I take to be a voluntary society of men joining themselves together of their own accord, in order to the public worshipping of God in such manner as they judge acceptable to him and effectual to the salvation of their souls." All discipline ought to tend to public worship, and "by means thereof the acquisition of eternal life. All discipline ought therefore to tend to that end, and all ecclesiastical laws to be thereunto confined. Nothing ought nor can be transacted in this society relating to the possession of civil and worldly goods." The only exceptions to this general rule of toleration are the cases of persons who hold "opinions contrary to human society or to those moral rules which are necessary to the preservation of civil society"; of Churches which are "constituted upon such a bottom that all those who enter into them do thereby *ipso facto* deliver themselves up to the protection and service of a foreign prince"; and, lastly, of atheists, because "promises, covenants, and oaths, which are the bond of human society, can have no hold upon an atheist."

This is the substance of Locke's first Letter on Toleration, and, if we strike out the exceptions, it would not be easy to give in a few words a better sketch of the views which at the present day are most widely popular upon the subject. They are identical with the theory which the French are constantly in the habit of putting forward, in rather finer words, about the separation between the temporal and spiritual powers. Lord Macaulay added hardly anything to them in his review of Mr. Gladstone; and Warburton takes Locke's *Letters on Toleration* as the foundation of his own treatise on the Alliance between the Church and the State. Notwithstanding all the popularity of which this is but a very slight specimen, it appears to us that the theory in question is unsatisfactory.

The first objection to it applies to the method on which it proceeds, which is to form a notion as to what a State ought to be, and then to make that notion the criterion by which you are to judge of the duties and functions of existing States. Locke's plan, in fact, would appear to have been to form in his own mind a scheme which appeared to him to be advantageous for the States with which he was acquainted, to take that as the model of a State, and then to condemn everything which diverged from it, on the ground that it was not agreeable to the law of nature. His whole theory, if fairly examined, is little more than a continued repetition of one thought in a variety of different forms of words; which thought is that the Church and the State are independent societies, having perfectly distinct objects in view, each of which is to be attained by the use of means altogether unfit for the attainment of the other. Why the Church and the State should thus be regarded is a question which he does not answer; and if his letters are contrasted with such a book, for instance, as Bossuet's *Politique tirée de l'Écriture Sainte*, the only result is that Locke takes one view of the matter and Bossuet another, while neither gives his readers the means of ascertaining which of the two is right. The truth appears to be that the problem to be solved is misconceived by writers like Locke. It is lost labour to attempt

* *Four Letters on Toleration*. By John Locke. (Vol. VI. of Trade Edition of Locke's Works.)

to form an abstract idea of a State by the process of taking such parts of existing institutions as you happen to like, and rejecting those which you happen to dislike, and then using the result as a model. The only soluble problem is, What, as a fact, are, and have been, the effects of such and such institutions, and are those effects good or bad? Moreover, in order to solve a problem of this sort, it is not enough to measure every institution by your own standard of what is useful or desirable. It is necessary to go further—to enter into the ideas and designs of those who founded the institutions which you are going to criticize, and to see what in the long run was the sort of result at which they aimed, and which they ultimately succeeded in bringing out. To say that, in point of fact, civil governments were all instituted for the preservation of property in the wide sense of the word, and that Churches are all voluntary societies for devotional purposes, is to say what is not true. What civil governments were instituted for, and whether for any specific purpose at all or not, is a question which, for want of distinct information, it is now impossible to answer; but nothing can be more obvious than that, from the very first commencement of such governments as those of which history gives us any record at all, we find them applied to purposes of a much wider kind, regarded with feelings, and demanding and receiving sacrifices, which are by no means consistent with the view that they existed merely or principally for police purposes. To take a trite example, let any one read the funeral oration of Pericles, and ask himself whether it is conceivable that he and the other citizens of Athens regarded their city in the light in which, according to Locke's view, they ought to have regarded it. It is perfectly clear that no such theory ever entered their heads. The Athenian was to Athens what a member is to the body. He derived from his city, not merely protection for his property, but his whole moral, social, political, and religious education. It was the sphere in which he lived and moved and had his being; and the same is true even in a stronger sense of the Roman citizen and the city of Rome. So, again, to speak of the Christian Church of the middle ages as a voluntary association for the purposes of religious worship and of getting to heaven, is to pervert all history. The mediæval Church was anything but a voluntary association. It was the most remarkable, and probably the most powerful, organization that ever existed in this world—making, and in case of need enforcing, claims to obedience upon all moral and religious questions, from all persons whatever, with a degree of vigour which no other institution ever displayed. It was of course open to Locke to say that the civil governments with which he was acquainted were fit only for police purposes, and that the Churches with which he was acquainted were useful only in so far as they were voluntary associations for purposes of worship; and there is no doubt much to be said for the opinion that Church and State are, as a fact, continually tending to assume those forms. But it does not follow that Locke's principles can be laid down *a priori* as if they were eternal truths applicable to all times and countries alike, and that the rules which flow from them can be universally prescribed as being of general and perpetual obligation.

Apart, however, from objections to Locke's method of inquiry, objections suggest themselves to the particular conclusions at which he arrived. The impression which his Letters leave on the mind is unsatisfactory, though it appears hard to blame him for what is certainly a form of honesty. Locke writes throughout, not as if he thought theological differences matters of little importance, but as if he thought them important in the highest degree. He continually insists on the doctrine that there is but one road to heaven, and his whole argument proceeds upon the extreme hardship of preventing people by force from having as good a chance as may be of discovering that road. Locke's zeal for toleration is much more the zeal of a sectarian in a minority than that of a man who has a low opinion of theological controversy in general. There is an air of illiberality, and something approaching to selfishness, in a great part of his writings on the subject, of which it is not easy to give an idea. He seems to be continually saying, We are all swimming for our lives, and likely enough to be drowned as it is. What can it matter to you whether I am drowned or not, and why cannot you let me take my chance in my own way, and according to my own judgment? This, however, is the fault, not of Locke, but of his antagonists. He applied honestly the principle for which they contended. If all religion is resolved into a tremendous system of criminal law, Locke's view of the case is altogether unanswerable. If God Almighty is the head inquisitor and persecutor who burns in everlasting fire every one who does not believe certain doctrines, all subordinate persecution becomes impertinent. If you are convinced that I shall certainly be damned if I do not believe what God has commanded me to believe, you ought to feel that your interference can make no real difference, unless you can prove that you, the persecutor, have a special Divine commission to persecute on behalf of specific well-ascertained doctrines. In short, all Locke's arguments become, from this point of view, entirely unanswerable as against the civil magistrate; for no civil magistrate ever was so absurd as to claim infallible knowledge on these subjects, in virtue of his magistracy; and if he had done so, the fact that magistrates differ in their religious views as much as private men would be conclusive against him. There is, however, one of Locke's arguments which, famous as it is, appears to us to be a fallacy. Persecution, says Locke, secures only outward conformity, and not inward persuasion, and it is inward persuasion

only which can really produce salvation. If, therefore, salvation is the object, why persecute? The answer to this is, I persecute, not for your sake, but for the sake of your children and neighbours. You would be damned as a heretic, at all events. Being persecuted into outward conformity, you will be damned as a hypocrite, and it matters little to you on which charge you are sentenced; but the consequence of persecuting you will be that your children will be brought up in the truth, and that your neighbours will not be seduced from it. This, however, is only one of Locke's arguments. It is not a link in a chain, and the answer to it does not affect the others.

The true arguments in favour of and against persecution always appear to us to depend upon a view of religion different from and wider than its aspect as a system of supernatural criminal law. If religions are regarded not merely as collections of propositions to be believed, and of practices to be observed, under pain of supernatural punishment hereafter, but as institutions intended (be their origin what it may) to exercise over the people by whom they are professed the deepest and most various of all influences—if, for instance, the Church as it existed in Western Europe in the middle ages was regarded as the great educator and teacher of the whole human race—it was surely the most natural thing in the world to use violence in order to prevent its authority from being questioned, and to maintain its influence undiminished. If we look at the difference between a Roman Catholic and a Protestant, as displayed either in nations or in individuals, whether in history or in speculation, it is surely not surprising that particular men or nations should vehemently prefer the one or the other type of character. It is quite intelligible that they should say, We will devote our whole lives, and use every energy of mind and body, and every resource of our nature, to plant Romanism or Protestantism in our borders, and to secure its power and development there to the utmost limit of time to which we can look forward. Such an object, whether right or wrong, is at least as intelligible as the fervour of attack and defence which was excited by the French Revolution; and there can be no doubt at all that persecution forms the natural outlet for such feelings. Charles V. and Philip II. did effectually stamp out Protestantism in various parts of their dominions, especially in Belgium and Spain. The power, as distinguished from the opinions, of the Pope and his clergy was effectually broken in this country by the legislation of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. After terrible convulsions, France had its wish, and did emphatically reject Protestantism, at all events in its religious and conservative form. In a word, the great argument for persecution is that it is in the nature of war, that religions are well worth fighting about, and that the arms used in the warfare are effective. As for the notion that all fighting and all force, except for the protection of person and property, is wrong in itself, it cannot be maintained for a moment without reducing history to the level of a Newgate Calendar. The ends of national existence—that is to say, the objects which national existence and the power of making laws are, as a fact, capable of procuring—are far wider than this. They may be described, in a word, as consisting in the development, the exercise, and the exaltation of human nature to the highest pitch of excellence of which it is capable. They embrace in fact, not merely the protection of existing interests, but the increase of human greatness and happiness in all its forms. Conquests like those of Alexander, the establishment of a religion like Christianity, the redistribution of property on principles better adapted to the happiness of the world than those which are recognised at any given moment, and the redistribution of political authority and artificial honours, are all matters which fall within the power of a nation, and of the laws which are the expression of its will; and history is full of cases in which their exercise has conferred enormous and durable benefits on mankind. If this be so, why is the forcible establishment, or the forcible suppression, of a religion to be regarded as a thing always and everywhere abominable and monstrous?

The answer to this—and, as it appears to us, the only answer—is that it is not possible to base the duty of toleration upon any such universal principles as those which are laid down by Locke. It is impossible to say that under no circumstances, at no time and at no place, can it be justifiable to persecute. There may be, and there probably are, races in which the belief of certain facts, a moral sympathy with particular precepts, and enthusiastic admiration for particular persons run so rapidly into one indistinguishable whole, and identify themselves so closely with principles and practices utterly at variance with the spirit of the national institutions and with the course which the vast majority of its members wish to run, that it is impossible to tolerate, and necessary either to persecute or to convert. The alternative "Drink or Fight," is by no means confined to the backwoods of America. There are states of society in which opinion, sentiment, and practice are so closely and inseparably united that neutrality and toleration are scarcely possible, and in such cases persecution can hardly be blamed. This, however, must be taken in connexion with another principle of the utmost importance and of universal application—the principle, namely, that free inquiry is the great, and indeed almost the only possible guarantee for the truth of any doctrines whatever. Persecution destroys this guarantee, and is therefore unfavourable to any intelligent and real belief in the truth of any creed whatever. This principle, however, goes a long way. It applies to supernatural as well as to human punishments for religious belief. If God Almighty is regarded as an omnipotent persecutor, and human

persecution is repudiated only as superfluous, men are not much better off than they were before. Toleration may be defended without admitting the moral innocence of religious error, and persecution may be defended without asserting the guilt of religious error; but the controversy between those who tolerate and those who persecute will never be treated justly except by those who admit its innocence. What can and ought to be said, with as much emphasis as may from time to time be required, in favour of toleration in our own age of the world, is that the religious questions which agitate Western Europe are perfectly capable of being discussed without violence, and that the use of violence would do unmixed harm, not only to the cause of truth, but also to the development and improvement of the whole character of mankind. None of the religions now in existence amongst us can, with any show of reason, be alleged to be so much better, truer, and more beautiful than all the rest, that it would be worth while to go to the terrible expense in labour, suffering, and heartburning which would be necessary to its establishment by force. On the other hand, all our existing forms of religion have so much good in them that it is highly desirable that they should mutually instruct each other; and there are besides a vast number of admirable influences of various kinds at work in the world which are not dependent upon religion at all, but to which religious persecution would in all probability be utterly fatal. These are the real arguments against persecution, and it appears improbable to the last degree that, now that human society has reached its present condition, their force will ever be diminished, or indeed will ever cease to increase. If this view of the matter be correct, it will follow that the fault of the ordinary commonplaces upon the subject of which Locke's Letters are the earliest, and one of the best, summaries is only that they apply to all ages what is true only of an age of high cultivation. If Locke had limited his argument to his own days, and had avoided the mistake—a mistake, as we have tried to show, which is altogether at variance with the tendency, if not with the express rules, of his own philosophy—of laying down broad *a priori* principles as the justification of particular propositions which in reality have a firm foundation of their own to rest upon, his Letters would have been as true in theory as they undoubtedly were useful in practice. It is, however, quite another question whether they would not have lost as advocacy what they gained as philosophy; and what was wanted there and then certainly was advocacy, and not philosophy. In Locke's days philosophy had still a long road to travel before it could step boldly out of the old leading-strings and swaddling-clothes, and preach its own doctrines in its own words from its own pulpit.

MICHELET'S LOUIS THE FIFTEENTH.*

WE have been led by this volume into a somewhat curious speculation. How much would a person who was absolutely ignorant of the reign of Louis the Fifteenth, or of any other portion of history, learn of it from M. Michelet's telling? The difficulty is to conceive total ignorance in such a case—such ignorance, we mean, as we must ourselves confess, and which very possibly M. Michelet shares, as to the internal affairs of Thibet while Louis the Fifteenth ruled over France. A person who had really never heard of Louis the Fifteenth before, and who in that state sat down to read about him in M. Michelet, would undoubtedly rise from his studies with the conviction that Louis was a profligate scoundrel, but we doubt whether he would carry away any clear or connected view of the wars or politics of his reign. Now it is hard to conceive a man who had never heard of Hannibal or of William the Third; but, given such a man, we are sure that he would get a very fair idea of either of those worthies by simply reading Arnold or Macaulay. Indeed we are not sure that this ideal state of ignorance is not a more hopeful state than that in which the general reader commonly sits down to a book. He who has learned nothing has at least nothing to unlearn. We cannot profess to speak from experimental knowledge. We are so far from it that we chanced to read M. Michelet with another history of the same time fresh in our minds. But even with this advantage or disadvantage, we were often puzzled. Of M. Michelet's genius no one has any doubt; if he had written nothing else, this volume alone would be witness enough. But genius is sometimes allied to madness, and the genius of M. Michelet is, as every one knows, of this same erratic kind. He does everything by fits and starts. There are passages in this volume which are simply perfect; admirable in every way, clear and vigorous, excellent alike in matter and in expression. These are mixed up with passages which are simply unintelligible, and with others which are simply disgusting. Half, or more than half, of the book consists of exclamations, dark allusions, epithets, mainly of abuse, whose application does not always explain itself at first sight. No person, no subject, is ever introduced in that distinct way in which an historian who wishes to be understood always will try to introduce his persons or subjects. We find ourselves in the middle of a war or of a scandal before we well know that we have reached the beginning of it. Some writers of history treat their readers in this way out of sheer dulness. Either they have no clear idea of anything themselves, or, if they have, they have no faculty of communicating anything clearly to others. But this charge is the very last which any one could justly bring against M. Michelet. He is the very embodiment of vivacity.

In fact we believe that the very obscurity of M. Michelet is owing to his own intensely clear realization of facts and persons. Perhaps we should rather say of his own conception of facts and persons; for of course the truth and justice of M. Michelet's ideas of them is quite another question. But in any case he knows so well what he means to say himself that he does not realize that other people do not know. He brings on the stage some object of his scorn; and that scorn, rather than admiration, should be the order of the day in writing the history of Louis the Fifteenth would not be wonderful even in another historian than M. Michelet. A Minister, a mistress, a foreign potentate, is brought forth, like Samson, to be mocked at. In most cases the victim richly deserves his fate. But it still remains far from clear what his offences are. He is set in the pillory, he is pointed at, shrieked over, covered with every sort of scandalous allusion, but a distinct indictment, a distinct description, is a thing which we never get. Almost the only exception is Damiens. Of him and of his previous life we do get a vivid picture. Perhaps it is because, in the reign of Louis the Fifteenth, a character like Damiens becomes comparatively respectable. It is hardly fair to call Damiens a murderer; but, looking on him as a murderer, there really are times when crime becomes honourable by the side of vice. There are many more chances of some ennobling element in brigands and pirates than in a man who has voluntarily chosen the swinish life which the King had chosen. And Damiens, if a murderer at all, was at least not a vulgar murderer for pelf or private spite. He was a fanatic, quite possibly a lunatic; characters, either of them, incomparably more honourable than that of Louis the Fifteenth.

But, wild as is M. Michelet's way of writing, it is a relief to turn to him after such a writer as M. Capefigue. We do not remember to have ever read anything more thoroughly revolting than the series of apologies, panegyrics, or whatever they are to be called, on Louis and his mistresses which M. Capefigue poured forth some years back. We never read anything pretending to be history or biography from which all sense of right and wrong had so completely vanished. Every offence, public or private, was to be condoned to people who were patrons of art—that is, not of art in any high or ennobling sense, but of all sorts of fashionable prettinesses. Nay, the occasional gleams of right feeling which now and then came over the mind of the King, and rather more commonly over the mind of Madame de Pompadour, the occasional consciousness that there was, after all, a great French nation whose welfare deserved some little attention now and then, are by M. Capefigue looked upon as weaknesses on the part of the King and his concubine, which withdrew their attention from the more important business of encouraging Boucher and Watteau. Now we need not tell any one that the vagaries of M. Michelet never take the same form as the vagaries of M. Capefigue. No one will be surprised to hear that the indignation of M. Michelet, if somewhat wild and incoherent, is, in these matters, at least always on the right side. Still, sin it is to belie the Devil; even Louis the Fifteenth is entitled to see his own indictment, and not to have new wickednesses attributed to him by insinuation. We know all about the Nesle sisters, all about the *Parc-aux-cerfs* already. But we must ask a plain question. Does M. Michelet mean, or does he not mean, to charge Louis with incest with his own daughters? He nowhere directly affirms it, but there are passages which seem to imply it. So in the earlier part of the book there are passages which seem to imply, if possible, grosser charges still against several persons. Now we all know M. Michelet's taste for this kind of subject. But, if he chooses to indulge it, he should indulge it with some regard to justice. These are matters about which it is as well for people to hold their tongues except under the strongest pressure of historic truth. But, if M. Michelet will speak about them at all, it is better to speak out than to damage people's characters by insinuation. Even if it be held that Louis himself is so black that nothing can make him blacker, still the characters of the princesses should at any rate not be sported away without distinct proof.

But there are better things than this in M. Michelet. Here is an important question as to the real state of France in the early days of Louis the Fifteenth. The great towns were undoubtedly increasing in population. What was the state of things in the country? Had misgovernment, and the depopulation which followed on misgovernment, in some sort wrought their own cure? Had depopulation increased the value of labour and so improved the condition of the labourer? M. Michelet says No, and quotes his contemporary evidence. The villages were utterly ruined, and their inhabitants were crowding into the towns. We do not pretend to decide the question of fact; but M. Michelet's view is at any rate clearly and vigorously put, and the remarks with which he ends are worth any number of pages of shrieking and gibbering:—

Que veut dire ici Sismondi en affirmant sans preuves que le travail reprit, que, par la mortalité même, le travailleur plus rare fut mieux payé, etc. ? Pure hypothèse. Pas un fait à l'appui dans les écrits contemporains.

Pour les campagnes, c'est absolument faux. Pour les villes, peu exact encore. Les ouvriers de luxe, qui sont toujours un petit nombre, travaillaient pour les enrichis, décoraient dans un goût charmant les splendides hôtels des Fermiers généraux. Hors de là, nul appel à la production. Les cinq cent mille familles qui à Paris ont subi le Vies, l'autre demi-million qui en province eut même ruine, tous ces gens ruinés ont-ils pu réparer si vite pour encourager l'industrie ? Et le gouvernement agit bien moins encore. La France sous Fleury offre ce spectacle curieux d'un grand État inerte, qui, loin d'édifier, n'achève rien, ne répare plus, ne met plus une pierre à la muraille ruinée, pas une planche aux vaisseaux de guerre; nul souvenir des ports, arsenaux, citadelles. Nul travail. Un vaste silence.

* *Histoire de France au dix-huitième Siècle. Louis XV. 1724-1757.* Par J. Michelet. Paris: Chamerot et Lauwereyns. 1866.

Une chose peut tromper, c'est que les villes, énormément grossies sous le Système, loin de diminuer, continuent d'engouffrer la foule. Et pourquoi s'y réfugie-t-on ? Le village est inhabitable. La ville, un abîme inconnu, est (vue de loin) une loterie ; là peut-être on aura des chances, tout au moins la misère plus libre ; l'atome inaperçu se perdra dans la mer humaine.

Let us again hear what M. Michelet has to say about Frederick of Prussia, especially as compared with the elder Bonaparte. Here is his first appearance in 1740 :—

Cette année-là est grande. En mai, Frédéric devient roi. En octobre, meurt l'Empereur. La guerre arrive, et le héros.

Le voici donc, le grand acteur du temps. Il reviendra de moment en moment, et nous le peindrons par ses actes. Il suffira de dire ici que personne ne l'avait prévu, qu'on ne supposait pas qu'un artiste, musicien, poète, qui, longtemps prisonnier et longtemps solitaire, n'aimait que les arts de la paix, qui déjà à trente ans avait l'embonpoint d'un autre âge, déployât tout à coup l'activité du militaire, qu'instruit par ses succès, instruit par ses revers, il serait peu à peu le plus grand général du siècle. Étonnant caractère qui, parmi ses défauts, ses fautes, n'en donna pas moins à son temps la plus haute leçon : le triomphe de la volonté.

Here again is the latter part of a somewhat long and very vigorous description, which shows no sign of any of M. Michelet's extravagances till just towards the end of the passage which we quote :—

Devenu roi (mai 1740), il se trouva recevoir de son père une bonne armée disciplinée, qui ne s'était jamais battue, de très-bons généraux, mais qui avaient peu guerroyé. Fort ridiculement on le compare à Bonaparte. L'heureux Corse eut la chance unique d'hériter de Masséna, d'Hoche, d'avoir à commander les vainqueurs des vainqueurs. Favori du destin, il reçut tout d'abord de la Révolution l'épée enchantée, infailible, qui permet toute audace, toute faute même. L'armée de Frédéric, qui n'avait fait la guerre que sur les places de Berlin, était dressée sans doute (et sur les idées excellentes du vieil Anhalt). Mais tout cela n'est rien. Une armée ne se forme qu'en guerre et sous le feu. Son roi, non moins qu'elle novice, l'y conduisit, l'y dirigea, lui apprit plus que la victoire, la patience, la résolution invincible, et en réalité c'est lui qui la forma. Ce que ne fut pas Bonaparte, Frédéric le fut : créateur.

Bonaparte eut en main l'instrument admirable, homogène, harmonique, de la France si anciennement centralisée. Frédéric eut en main un damier ridicule, fait d'hier et de vingt morceaux, une armée composée et de recrues forcées, et d'hommes de toute nation. Il eut un pays sans frontière, bigarré, bref un monstre. C'est la création d'un besoin. Contre le monstre Autriche, il a fallu le monstre Prusse. Comment eût-il agi, ce corps dégingandé, s'il n'eût en Frédéric trouvé l'unité, le moteur ?

Here is doubtless somewhat too much of the idolatry of force ; we quote the passage mainly as a specimen of the way in which M. Michelet can write when he chooses. It is a strange thing that a man who can write like this should stoop to go on mocking over and over again at Maria Theresa, simply for being the mother of a large family. It is equally strange when, towards the end of the book, in his survey of the intellectual state of the age, he goes off into rhapsodies about plants and molluscs, "L'Unité centrale," "Unité d'amour," "Le vrai soleil du monde, l'Amour qui en est l'âme," and so on for several pages. From this sort of thing it is a relief to turn back to the trial and the tortures of Damians, which are dealt with throughout in M. Michelet's best manner. Not the least striking part of the scene is Louis himself, his skin just grazed by the penknife, fancying the knife poisoned, preparing for death, forgiving his murderer, sending for his confessor, sending away his mistress, forgetting that he is wounded and going about as if well, then taking to his bed again, and lastly, recovering, thinking for a moment of sending Damians to a madhouse, but at last consenting to the infernal cruelties which all the gay world went to see as the most taking of shows. Here we have M. Michelet at his best ; instead of a shriek he gives us a real sarcasm :—

Il était fort. Et quatre forts chevaux ne purent l'écarteler. On en ajouta deux, avec peu de succès. Le bourreau, excédé, peut-être ayant pitié (de quoi il fut puni), monta et demanda aux commissaires "la permission de donner un coup de tranchoir aux jointures," ce qui fut refusé d'abord "pour le faire souffrir davantage." (*Barbier*, VI, 507.) Cela aurait trop abrégé. Nombre d'amateurs distingués, de grandes dames, qui avaient loué cher les croisées de la Grève, n'auraient pas eu pour leur argent. Les commissaires auraient paru peu zélés pour le Roi. Cependant à la longue, pour en finir avant la nuit qui venait, on permit de trancher. Les deux cuisses partirent les premières, puis une épaule. Il expira à six heures un quart, le jour finissant (23 mars 1757).

We have spoken of M. Michelet's picture of Frederick of Prussia. He always rises at the mere mention of his name. We should like to follow him through many parts of his narrative, puzzling as he often makes it, of the general European politics of the time. But it is indeed strange that even M. Michelet cannot thoroughly realize that there was no such thing as an "Austrian Empire" in the eighteenth century. We hear once or twice of "l'empire autrichien," and that as something different from "le trône impérial." It is almost more strange to hear the Emperor Francis the First spoken of as "le mari de l'impératrice." Now undoubtedly Francis of Lorraine, had he not been the husband of Maria Theresa, would not have had the faintest chance of being elected Emperor ; still he was Emperor, and it was only as his wife that the Queen of Hungary—Europe then knew of a Kingdom of Hungary—held the rank of Empress. But it is something that, if there was an Emperor, whether Austrian, German, or Roman, he at least was not "Mundi Dominus," "Lord of the World." That dignity, according to M. Michelet at least, had passed to one of his Electors. We have read the following passage several times, and there is only one meaning that we can get out of it :—

Dès son grenier de Parme, et avec la bassesse des petits princes d'Italie, elle [Elizabeth Farnese] avait pour César, pour l'Empereur, pour l'Autrichien, cette admiration de valet, qu'ont en les Allemands, les Georges de Hanovre, restés valets sur le trône du monde.

We must decline the honour as somewhat dangerous. Still the doctrine that the throne of England is the throne of the world may make us forgive one or two slaps which M. Michelet gives us here and there in other parts of his volume.

A GENERAL OF MARINES.*

IT is perhaps surprising that a General of Marines should exist at all, for he is necessarily a general who has never commanded, and possibly a general who has never seen, an army. Indeed an officer of marines, of any rank whatever, has hardly an opportunity of seeing a brigade or even a battalion of his corps, except upon Woolwich or Southsea Common, or some other place equally remote from danger. It must be owned that whenever this corps appears at field-day or review, it excites admiration by the perfection of its discipline ; and wherever it has been called upon to serve, either afloat or ashore, it has nobly sustained the title of "royal and loyal" which was given to it in acknowledgment that the marines have been faithful found among the faithless in more than one alarming mutiny. There might undoubtedly be some attraction in a service where the rigidity of discipline was by force of circumstances relaxed. A marine, although supplied with stock and shako, was encouraged to make himself useful on board ship, which he could only do by studying smartness on the naval rather than the military model. An officer who had made the most of his opportunities would become, after a few years' service, almost equally useful as a sailor and a soldier, and knowing the value of the varied experience thus acquired, he could afford to smile at the traditional supposition that his corps was only sent afloat to be gulled by seamen ; and if he were assailed by the time-worn joke which compared a marine officer to an empty wine-bottle, he could always avail himself of the equally familiar answer, "He has done his duty, and he is ready to do it again."

The officers of marines are probably derived from that portion of the middle-class of society which is fertile in physical vigour, courage, and sense of honour, but is scantily supplied with money, which buys advancement in the army, or with political influence, which commands it in the navy. If a youth of adventurous disposition were article to "an eminent lawyer of Yarmouth," in the year 1804, it is easy to understand that, although he might have preferred the army to the marine service, he would gladly exchange "the close and sedentary habits of an attorney" for a commission in a corps which was apt to find hard work and danger more plentiful than honours or rewards. Accordingly we read that the author of the *Memoir* which now lies before us overcame his father's desire to see him a member of the legal profession, and was presented with a second-lieutenant's commission in the Royal Marine Corps. There is something touching in the brief preface reviewing a career which, having thus commenced, extended over sixty years. The author begins by expressing contentment with his lot, which was one of long and hard service, and late and small reward :—

He has experienced great risks of life, cares, troubles, vexations, disappointments, sickness, and affliction. He has known what it is to extend his sensibility to external attachments, to suffer for the sufferings of those who were most dear to him, and to feel the stroke of death that cut off his fairest hopes of sublunary bliss. He has toiled with ill-success for the means of temporal enjoyments, and has been visited by griefs which use has accommodated to his nature. And in this review of his destiny he believes that he sees the general lot of all the human race.

The desire which probably was strongest in his mind when he exchanged the attorney's desk for a man-of-war was gratified abundantly, and therefore why should he complain ? In battle, tempest, and disease he faced death in every form. He served in the action off Ferrol and at Trafalgar ; he barely escaped with life from a burning ship ; he cruised off the enemy's coast during our war with the United States, and assisted at the capture of one of their most formidable ships ; he commanded a battalion under Sir Hugh Gough amid the crafty people, and still more treacherous climate, of China, and showed himself equal to any duty on land as he had been at sea ; and—perhaps not the least of his services—he took under his order some recruiting parties, and saved the city of Salisbury from a mob in the riots which followed the trial of Queen Caroline. His first cruise was made in the 74-gun ship *Ajar*, which belonged to the fleet commanded first by Sir Robert Calder, and afterwards by Lord Nelson. He describes briefly and simply what he saw of the battle of Trafalgar. "I was much struck with the preparations made by the blue-jackets, the majority of whom were stripped to the waist, and had a handkerchief bound tightly round the head and over the ears, to deaden the noise of the cannon." He was employed to deliver to the men on the maindeck the purport of Nelson's celebrated signal, and was disappointed at the effect which it produced. "Do our duty !" said the men, "of course we'll do our duty. I've always done mine, haven't you ? Let us come alongside of 'em, and we'll soon show whether we will do our duty." These expressions may doubtless be relied upon as a genuine product of the British sailor's mind. The men cheered vociferously out of love for Nelson, but the truth must be told that, on the maindeck of the *Ajar*, they did not seem to see much in his signal. There is justice in the author's complaint that the marines contributed as much as the sailors to the victory, and got almost nothing of the reward. When it comes to

* *Memoirs and Services of the late Lieutenant-General Sir S. B. Ellis, K.C.B., Royal Marines.* From his own Memoranda. Edited by Lady Ellis. London : Saunders, Otley, & Co. 1866.

action at close quarters, a captain or lieutenant of marines, with a handful of steady, well-disciplined soldiers, is a most valuable support to the more desultory efforts of the seamen. But it almost necessarily follows from the fragmentary disposition of the marines on board a fleet of thirty ships, that their share in gaining a victory will be undervalued. This is one of the disadvantages of a service which, nevertheless, the author preferred to service under articles of clerkship. The *Ajax* was afterwards employed in the Mediterranean, and she formed one of the squadron sent under Sir J. T. Duckworth to the Dardanelles to demonstrate against the Turks. The ship was destroyed by fire off Tenedos, within sight of the plain where the hero whose name she bore looked his last upon the sun. The author escaped in a boat from the perils of drowning and explosion, but three hundred of the crew perished. His next ship formed part of the expedition to the Scheldt in 1809, and, getting aground, her guns became engaged with French field-pieces, while the marines and other troops on board were prepared to land, if necessary, to oppose their infantry. However, the ship was lightened, and hove off. The author, in another ship, was at the taking of Guadaloupe in 1810. He was almost constantly afloat from this time to the peace, and was much employed in co-operating with our army in Portugal and Spain. He saw from the sea the flashes of guns fired at St. Sebastian, and encountered, as he came to anchor, the floating corpses of those who had fallen in the siege. In January, 1815, he had the honour to be sent to take possession of the United States frigate *President*, which surrendered to the frigates *Endymion* and *Pomona*. The brunt of the action was borne by the *Endymion*, as the *Pomona*, in which the author served, could not come up with the enemy so soon. However, the surrender was actually made to the *Pomona*, and when Commodore Decatur learned her name he exclaimed, "I thought it was the *Majestic*; I could have sunk you in five minutes." The *Majestic* was a line-of-battle ship, and she was near enough to have left the American small hope of escape, even if she could have beaten the two English frigates. But, in fact, the *Endymion* alone would have been almost a match for her, as she was one of the few 24-pounder frigates which our Admiralty got to sea when the war was nearly over. The capture was made at midnight, which will account for the American Commodore failing to distinguish between a frigate and a line-of-battle ship. The surrender of the *President* was marked by the same incidents as attended the capture of every American ship taken in that war. There were guns on board of her named Nelson, Nile, Trafalgar, &c., and men who had fought them jumped overboard to avoid surrender, which would have been followed by death in a more ignominious form. This was the author's last exploit in the great naval war. In the year 1820, being on recruiting service at Salisbury, the peace and safety of that city were endangered by a mob, which threatened to murder the magistrates, and level the Council Chamber. "At this juncture," says the author, "I moved off with all the united recruiting parties, who were well armed according to the best available means, to the assistance of the justices in council." The presence of an officer of experience and resolution had a good effect upon the mob. The authorities expressed their gratitude to Lieutenant Ellis "for prompt and valuable assistance," and to his men "for steady and soldierlike conduct," which indeed they were likely enough to display under his command.

The author went again to sea in 1823, and in 1825; when he had served twenty-one years, he became a captain. In 1837 he embarked on board the *Wellesley*, which carried the flag of the Commander-in-Chief of the East Indies. In this ship he accompanied the armament which made war in China in 1841, and throughout that year he served principally on shore, to the full satisfaction of his General, Sir Hugh Gough. The greatest danger of such a war arises from the unhealthy climate. In March he writes that he was very unwell, suffering from diarrhoea and fever of weeks' duration. A party of marines being ordered up the Canton river in boats, he was not sufficiently recovered to attend them. In May he landed in command of a battalion of marines, forming part of the force destined to attack Canton. He was under the great disadvantage of having to form the battalion as the men landed, many of them meeting for the first time. This disadvantage is inherent in the constitution of the force, and it is highly honourable that, in spite of it, the services of the marines on shore may compare with those of the most distinguished regiments of the army. The storming of Canton was obviated by payment of a ransom. The author's service was rewarded by a gratifying letter from Sir Hugh Gough, and a very complimentary brigade order. These testimonials were the more creditable because they were earned under disability from sickness. A little later he writes that three of his sergeants, all his officers, and himself were on the sick list, and that fully half of the force which had been before Canton was unfit for service. In attempting to cross from Macao to Hong Kong in a small trader, he narrowly escaped shipwreck in a typhoon. "Such was the force and fury of the gale, that the *Hebe*, with two anchors down, was fast drifting on a rocky island to leeward." But he escaped to receive for his services at Canton the moderate reward of a majority, and to read in the *London Gazette* a despatch from the Commodore on the station which reminded the Admiralty that "this meritorious old officer was in Sir Robert Calder's action, at Trafalgar, in the *Potomac*, and in many other very brilliant affairs." The despatch expressed the Commodore's thanks and admiration for the order which he established in the battalion, and the gallantry with which he led

the advance of the force. The quiet love of the author for hard fighting is excellently expressed in a passage of his journal of later date, where he says that, as little impression could be made by shot on an almost impenetrable fortified work, "Captain Bouchier most kindly and considerately yielded to my suggestion to let me land with my detachment, and drive the Chinese from their position." In this dashing exploit there was no casualty. "It appeared," as he says, with the simple piety of his character, "that we were under the especial care of Providence." It might be added, by anybody except the author, that the party was exceedingly well handled. At the storming of Chinghae, the veteran officer of marines displayed a bodily activity which younger officers of the army might have envied. Some of his men, who had learned a useful lesson on board ship, managed to scramble without scaling-ladders into an embrasure, and passed a rope down from the ramparts, whereby their commander followed, and he helped up the Admiral. There is no reason why soldiers should not learn, in their abundant leisure, to do some of the things that are done by sailors; but our army, in spite of the example of our neighbours, who can never have enough of military gymnastics, obstinately adheres to a system under which it appears that no light infantry man can catch a Fenian. The bloodless capture of Ning-po was the last service of the author in the field. Early in 1842 he returned home in the *Wellesley*, carrying with him letters from the Admiral and General acknowledging, in the most handsome manner, the assistance which he had rendered in the campaign.

Thus, having served in every quarter of the world and against every enemy of his country—having fought with French fleets, with American frigates, and with Chinese armies, having faced the perils of a ship on fire, of a lee shore, and of a pestilential climate—he returned to England to encounter another danger against which nothing that he had learned amid so many "moving accidents by flood and field," nor even the year's training which he had had in an attorney's office, availed for his protection. After his return he remained attached to the Plymouth division of marines until 1847. During this period we grieve to state that he was induced by some speculators to allow his name to appear as director of one of the many Railway Companies in which that time was fertile. The usual consequences ensued. The Direct Exeter and Plymouth Railway became a failure, and entailed a loss upon the author, not only of the whole of his hard-earned batta and savings, but also of a large portion of his income. Alas! that a man who had nerve and skill to steer a ship between Scylla and Charybdis should be lured by male sirens into the inextricable entanglements of the Court of Chancery! Instead of enjoying ease and honour in his old age, he was brought into the miserable position of a contributory under a winding-up. The resignation to the will of heaven which he expresses in the first page of his *Memoir* must have been severely tried when this last affliction came upon him. He died in 1865, having served upwards of sixty years in the Royal Marines, and risen by sheer force of merit to the position of Lieutenant-General and K.C.B. Having neither friends nor fortune, he did all by his own hand. His *Memoir* has been edited by his widow, whom he married when he was sixty years of age. The book has the rare merit of being short, and it is homely and unpretending, like the author, who has left behind him in its pages the best possible example of what an officer of marines should be.

DR. DÖLLINGER ON UNIVERSITIES.*

IT is not long since we had occasion to notice Mr. Mill's inaugural address before the University of St. Andrews. Much about the same time, Dr. Döllinger, who holds the office of Rector this year at Munich (for at the German, as at the Scotch, Universities it is an annual one), was also delivering an inaugural discourse, which has since been published, on the Past and Present of Universities. Dr. Döllinger's high character, his profound learning, and the position he occupies as the acknowledged leader of the Liberal Catholic party on the Continent, combining strict orthodoxy, in the Roman Catholic sense, with a breadth and genuine liberality of mind removed far as the poles asunder from the narrowness and intolerance of Ultramontanism, give a peculiar interest to what he may have to say. And though his present lecture, as the title indicates, is mainly an historical sketch, it throws much light incidentally on his views on questions of the day, besides the merit it necessarily possesses as a record—from one thoroughly familiar with the subject, and who has spent a long life, first as lecturer, then as Professor, in one of the principal German Universities—of the origin and growth of the University system in Europe. Dr. Döllinger, to adopt a happy expression of Dr. Newman's, is "a man of facts, as a German should be"; but this of course has not secured him from the violent attacks of his Ultramontane critics, who dislike nothing so heartily as facts—and with reason, for nothing is so fatal to their most cherished theories. We are not at all surprised, therefore, to hear that his adherence to the principle of mixed Universities has already exposed him in the columns of the *Westminster Gazette* to the somewhat inconsequent charge of sympathy with Socinianism! Our present purpose, however, is, not to waste words on assailants who injure nobody but themselves, but to give our readers some account of the contents of the address now before us.

The earliest Universities made no claim to that universality of

* Die Universitäten sonst und jetzt. Von Dr. Döllinger. 1867.

knowledge or of teaching which their name would seem to imply. They were schools of one, or at most of two, sciences. The first was simply a school of medicine, at Salerno, which had attained some reputation in the eleventh century; in the middle of the twelfth a school of law was founded at Bologna, which was removed in the thirteenth to Padua; and the first royal foundation of the kind was established in 1224 at Naples. Thenceforth the Italian Universities were almost exclusively devoted to the cultivation of civil and canon law, which was the only road of preferment for the secular clergy; and thus Dante complains that "none will study anything but the Decretals," and Roger Bacon says that "the Italian jurisprudence has for forty years destroyed the study of wisdom," i.e. philosophy and theology, and that, but for the Franciscans and Dominicans, "all true knowledge would be lost." In 1262 there were twenty thousand students of law at Bologna. If we turn northwards, the High School of Paris, commencing early in the thirteenth century, soon became famous, first as a *Studium Generale*, then as a University. There philosophy and theology were sedulously cultivated, and men often spent fifteen or sixteen years in the study of theology, prosecuting it up to the age of forty. Almost half the city was absorbed by the University, so that "the Oxford of to-day, in a local and architectural point of view only, is a picture of the old Parisian High School." So late as the end of the sixteenth century, and after the religious divisions had thinned its numbers, the Venetian Ambassador speaks of thirty thousand students there—more than were to be found in all the Italian Universities together. Even Paris, however, was not, in the full modern sense of the word, a University, for it had, throughout the middle ages, no Faculty of Law. While Italy and France were thus provided for, and in England Oxford and Cambridge, "still to this day the two intellectual eyes of the British Empire," had flourished since the thirteenth century, Germany had no native school, and her students had to go abroad for their education; so that an ingenious theory was invented to explain the facts, and it became a common saying that Divine Providence had allotted to each of the leading nations of Europe its own speciality—to Rome the priesthood, to Paris the *Studium*, to Germany the Empire. In 1348 the Emperor Charles IV. founded the first German University at Prague, copied from the Parisian model; Vienna followed in 1365, and three more later in the century, but they were mere exotics, and did not take root in the soil. Very different might have been the future, both of Germany and the Church, had any national system of law been originated there, instead of the mere mechanical adherence to the Roman law, corrupted as it was by the glosses of the later mediæval Italian jurists, with its universal practice of torture, and its theory of monarchical absolutism. The frequent Councils held during the fifteenth century (there were four General Councils in the first half of it) gave an impetus to the study of theology and law, and nine more Universities were founded in Germany; but the only German philosopher and the only jurist of any repute, Nicolas of Cusa and Peter of Andlau, held aloof from them. The decaying, but still dominant, method of scholasticism was a heavy incubus on the Faculties both of Theology and of Arts. This sketch will show that the history of their mediæval Universities is typical of the national character of France, England, and Germany. The centralizing tendencies of the nation, which make Paris the only place where an educated Frenchman likes to live, found expression in its one University seated in the metropolis. England, on the contrary, which abjures centralization, and has ever pursued a twofold aim of practical utility and political freedom, has naturally had two Universities, correcting and supplementing each other, which retain to this day their republican constitution and independence, and represent respectively "the two leading tendencies of the English mind, the ecclesiastical and the mathematical." In Germany the decentralizing tendencies (*particularismus*) which gradually dissolved the unity both of the Empire and the Church led to a number of small Universities being founded in various cities.

With the Reformation sprung up a new order of things, and the German Universities became "the arsenals where the weapons of war were forged, and often the battlefields where the victory or defeat of the rival doctrines was decided." Accordingly, the German princes, who always claimed to fix the faith of their subjects, used them (as the Jesuits of the period often used the confessional and Lutherans the pulpit), as *instrumenta dominationis*, keeping the appointment to professorial chairs, especially those of theology, in their own hands. All that can be said of the seventeenth century is that the Universities survived that "darkest age of German history" and the Thirty Years' war; but the Catholic Universities scarcely deserved the name, while the Protestant were completely subordinated to theological interests and antipathies, and their history is the history of the contest between Lutheran orthodoxy on the one hand, and Calvinism, Syncretism, and Pietism on the other. Up to the beginning of the eighteenth century all lectures were delivered in Latin, which, however convenient a resource for dull mediocrity and limited knowledge, was fatal to any real originality and comprehensiveness of teaching. Halle held the first rank among German Universities from 1690 to 1730, when Wolf and Spangenberg were banished. Göttingen, founded in 1738 under British protection, took the lead for the next fifty years, and to its influence on the national mind may be traced the origin of the unique celebrity since attained by German historical writers. Later in the century, Kant, "the great reformer of philosophy," made Königsberg famous, while Jena, long known as a school

of strict Lutheran orthodoxy, became in the hands of Fichte and Schelling the theatre of a great philosophical movement. The true commencement, however, of the greatness of German Universities is in the present century. Many old ones disappeared in the political disturbances which ushered it in, but in 1810 the King of Prussia founded at Berlin the first German University since the Reformation which had no confessional character or object. Humboldt, Wolf, Fichte, Schleiermacher, and Savigny were among its original professors; it now numbers 2,180 students. From that time there has been a steady advance, so that in our own day every branch of science finds its proper place in the German Universities as part of an organic whole, through a modest division of labour and due recognition of "the solidarity of all knowledge." And thus it may be said that Germany, which came last into the field, is the only country at this day which possesses *bond fide* Universities. France has only special schools, of law, medicine, exact sciences, or letters, the co-existence of several Faculties at Paris and Strasburg without any bond of internal coherence being exceptions rather apparent than real; and the English Universities are but "schools on a large scale combined with clerical colleges," which form cultivated gentlemen, and a clergy with a classical and literary rather than a theological education, but do not train jurists, physicians, or natural philosophers. Dr. Döllinger adds that he does not mean to blame the English Universities, which he considers excellent of their kind, and admirably adapted for accomplishing what the nation requires of them; and that he has often envied the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, a bequest of the mediæval system which has disappeared in Germany, except, oddly enough, at Tübingen. The Scotch Universities he places much lower than the English, and he accounts for their inferiority by the utilitarianism of the Scotch character, quoting Professor Mackie's testimony in 1855 (which, however, must be received with considerable reserve) that "learning is at the lowest possible ebb" in them. In North America there are, properly speaking, no Universities, the institutions so named being merely designed for conferring degrees in law and theology. It is curious that while theology holds so high a place in America, the youngest country of the world, in Italy, the ancient home of civilization, few of the Universities possess any theological Faculty at all; the clergy, who are the most numerous in Europe in proportion to the population, being content with the elementary instruction of the 217 episcopal seminaries. This, Dr. Döllinger justly observes, is quite enough to account for the great gulf which divides the Italian clergy from the educated laity both of the middle and the upper classes. Much the same result has followed from the same cause in France, though there the moral reputation of the priesthood stands higher than in Italy. The Spanish Universities have sunk into utter contempt; in Russia they are in their first novelty, and are mere imitations of the German. It is remarkable, again, that while German Switzerland has three Universities, French Switzerland has not one. No very high praise is accorded to the Universities of Holland, Belgium, Denmark, or Sweden. Copenhagen has not produced any distinguished men of late, besides the philologists Madvig and Rask, except in theology, such as Grundtvig and Martensen. The latter, by the way, quite deserves to be known beyond the limits of his own country, and we are very glad to see that his work, *Die christliche Dogmatik*, has been translated into English.

After this review Dr. Döllinger considers himself justified in pronouncing Universities a special property and product of the German national mind, which he considers the most cosmopolitan and many-sided in its gifts of any in Europe. Hence too, from their capacity for understanding and describing other nations, as well as from their unwearied energy in digging out the truth and getting to the bottom of things, the Germans have won their European eminence as historians, and this notwithstanding the natural difficulty of the language to foreigners, and the obscurity of style in too many of their writers. Shakespeare and Dante find their deepest commentators, not among their own countrymen, but among Germans. Another circumstance which has promoted the success of the German Universities—and here Dr. Döllinger touches on a question of great practical interest to ourselves—has been the co-operation of Catholics and Protestants, once thought an impossibility, but now "more and more become the rule"; and he records his emphatic testimony that where, as at Tübingen and Bonn, the theological Faculties of the two Confessions stand side by side, "unmistakeable benefit has resulted from this connexion." Some of our readers may recollect that he dwelt on this point in its wider bearings in the speech delivered, three years ago, before the Munich Congress, an excellent summary of which appeared at the time in the *Home and Foreign Review*. The four elements which go, according to Dr. Döllinger's estimate, to make up the true ideal of a University, and which he thinks are fairly realized in his own country, are, that it should impart the higher general education, prepare men for the civil service, train future teachers, and enlarge the domain of science through corporate bodies devoted to investigation and literary activity. It is however, above all, the historical mind which consecrates men to be "the priests of knowledge and teachers of youth," and of this we may take Niebuhr, Humboldt, Jacob Grimm, and Karl Ritter as representatives. We see its results alike in the cultivation of legal, political, medical, philological, and philosophical study, while its importance is pre-eminent in theology, "since Christianity is fact and history." After adverting to the new function of Universities in our own day, as mediating between the traditions of the past and

modern thought, and constituting "in public opinion the supreme court of appeal in intellectual matters," the Rector addresses himself in conclusion to the students, and reminds them, in a passage which we wish we could transfer entire to our columns, that the professor's duty is to be a receiver as well as a giver, and that, while teaching with authority, he should so teach that his authority may become continually less needed, and his hearers better able to stand on their own feet. He bids them never swear by the words of any master, but remember that the chief benefit of a University education lies not so much in the particular knowledge acquired as in "the awakening and development of those mental powers which will enable them to overcome every error, whether from without or from within, and to discover truth by the independent action of their own minds." And turning, lastly, to the theological students, with whom he is himself more directly concerned, he tells them that the science they are following can then only attain its princely dignity when it knows how to avail itself of the help of all its sisters, and does not shrink away, like a timid woman, from every fresh line of inquiry or inconvenient product of historical research. They must be, according to the saying attributed to Christ by an old tradition, "good exchangers" (*ῥαπίζοντες ὁκίμοι*), knowing that "nothing divine, that is, nothing true—for all truth comes originally from God—should be foreign to them," and taking as their motto, "Theologus sum, nihil divini a me alienum puto." There is no fear of such a course leading them to substitute an abstract Pantheism for the living and personal God of conscience, or to deny that free-will to which our inmost consciousness testifies, still less to admit the materialism which treats man as only a better organized ape.

Such is but a brief summary of the salient points of an address which extends over more than fifty pages, and which well deserves a place by the side of the speech we have already referred to, on the "Past and Present of Catholic Theology," delivered by Dr. Dollinger before the Munich Congress in the September of 1863. It is not often that such breadth of sympathy and judicial calmness of tone are to be found in a great theologian, and a theologian too of what has not been inaptly called the most dogmatic Church in Christendom. Dr. Dollinger never forgets that he is a man and a German, as well as a priest. And the tendency of ecclesiastical sympathies is so strong, even in superior minds, to obscure, if not to displace, the healthy sentiment of patriotism and love of truth and justice for themselves, and apart from their real or supposed bearings on particular interests, that we cannot but hail with satisfaction as well as respect the testimony afforded, in these and other publications of his, to the existence of so different a spirit in a leading Catholic divine.

LADY LLANOVER'S GOOD COOKERY.*

WHEN we consider the evils that flesh is heir to, and the consequences which these evils produce on the mind and, eventually, on the life and career of every man, we are ready to subscribe to the French doctrine which places cookery among the highest arts of civilization. Digestion governs the world. If we look around us, who are the men that invariably succeed? They are not the men of the profoundest intellect, the most vivid imagination, or the most laborious industry. These men perform highly valuable functions, and often bequeath invaluable productions to the world; but they are not the men of whom it can be said, in the sense usually affixed to the words, that they are successful men. Men who succeed need not have very subtle minds, or brilliant imaginations, or marvellous powers of industry. Some industry, some imagination, and some acuteness are, doubtless, indispensable. But the one indispensable factor is a good digestion. The laborious man or the industrious man is often of an atrabilious temperament, gloomy and austere; or he is nervous, fidgety, anxious, and fretful. In neither case is he successful. He may consume gallons of midnight oil on some very clever or very learned book, but after being a three weeks' lion he will find himself supplanted in the homage of society by his own book, or by some sharp, quick-witted, off hand spark, who picks his brains, repeats his sayings, appropriates his facts or his inferences, and gains all the credit that is really due to the genius and industry of a discontented dyspeptic. Who is the successful man? The man with a good stomach, ample barrel, broad face, glowing cheeks, and a ready smile, which may denote good-humour, sympathy, or perfect indifference. Who does not know the "capital good fellow" of society, with his rosy gills, habitual smile, and white teeth, his little innuendoes, and his significant looks, indicating that he knows your latest secret and last-formed plans? Then the *aplomb* with which he gives you the last piece of social or political gossip, and the authority with which he augurs Mr. Gladstone's next move or Lady Adeline's next engagement. Whence comes this marvellous *éclat*? How has a man, probably ten times more selfish and unsympathetic than half the thoughtful, studious men about him, got the reputation of being such a good fellow? Simply from that faculty which goes a great way to make a man a successful leader at the Bar or in the House of Commons—a good stomach. He has no fits of *malaise*, *honte*, of nervous trepidation, of painful irresolution, or more painful compunction. No delicate scruples, no morbid apprehensions, no tender regards, disturb his equanimity or arrest his purpose. It is the same thing to him whether he makes or cuts a friend,

whether he throws into his normal laugh the tone of hearty geniality or careless indifference. His main capacity is to enjoy life; and enjoy it he will in his own way, and at all costs. He thinks it strange that other men should be shy or nervous or scrupulous. He has none of these feelings, and he believes that he is all the happier for being without them. He has got the one thing needful—the thing which half his friends would give their lives to have, and the other half are losing their lives because they have it not—a good stomach. So he goes on, growing in success and favour with men and women till the fated hour when the long-worked liver begins to strike, and the gastric juices to fail, and men and women to smile no more.

It is clear that, if all men had good stomachs, cookery would be a subject of comparative insignificance. But, in fact, there are as few good stomachs as there are good figures; consequently there is the same demand for good cooks as there is for good tailors. As the next best thing to having a good figure is to have clothes that will neutralize the natural defects, so the next best thing to having a good stomach is to have food which will assimilate with a weak digestion. And whoever gives us the means of obtaining this confers a boon upon all civilized humanity.

Lady Llanover is the last contributor to the stores of our culinary literature. A certain ambitiousness distinguishes her Ladyship's style and plan. She starts with a conception of her work which is indeed new, but not true to nature. She imagines a Welsh hermit dwelling in a Cambrian cavern, with Cambrian widows to cook his simple repasts; and to him repairs a traveller worn out with the gaieties and dinners of a London season. The traveller and the hermit enter on a conversation *de omnibus rebus*, and end by talking about cookery and recipes. Railways, servants, water-supply, reaping, intellectual progress, and digestible food furnish the staple of their dialogue. The innocent and curious inquirer will naturally anticipate that a system of cookery illustrated by the example of a Cambrian anchorite must at any rate possess the virtue of economy. Home-made bread, water from the spring, wild strawberries, goat's milk, curds, cream, cheese and eggs, with an occasional reference to mountain mutton, will naturally constitute the elements of the solitary's *cuisine*. "It is found," will cry the half-famished couple in Pentonville lodgings, who have been trying for five years to live on two hundred a year. "Here at last is the haven of our conjugal hopes." A Welsh cottage under the brow of lofty mountains, on which skip playful Welsh goats, a garden with Welsh potherbs, and two such nice dear old Welsh widows, who will roast the kid, bake the bread, milk the goats, and churn the cheese! It is very pretty indeed to the imagination. But we fear Lady Llanover's book will not bring consolation to the class which struggles to live on even 300*l.* a year. We will leave the hopeful and economical reader to judge for himself.

We begin by a description of the mode in which a hermit, living in a cave, prepares hashed mutton, a dish not unfamiliar to persons of modest incomes:—

The Welsh widows then produced from an inner repository some firm brown jelly from the mutton bone, which he put into a saucepan (or double), surrounded, as before, by hot water. The widows then chopped, in careful proportions, onion, celery, and turnip; the whole quantity together was about a quarter of a pound. These they fried in a small well-tinned iron saucepan (the Hermit did not approve of copper), with very fine fat, which he said had been taken off the stock of the stewed beef which the Traveller had eaten cold, and of which he had so much approved. They stirred the chopped vegetables and the fat rapidly round and round for ten minutes by the clock; after which they shook in, with a dredger, as much flour as was sufficient to form the whole mass into a moderately stiff paste. They stirred in the flour for five minutes more, and then transferred the whole into the stock, which by this time, from a jelly, had become hot and liquid. They again stirred the whole briskly together, and left it to simmer for a quarter of an hour.

He then asked the Traveller for his opinion. He pronounced it to be like good brown thickened soup; after which he tasted it, and asked his friend to do the same. They both agreed that a little more celery and sweet herbs would render it a most excellent made gravy.

When finally flavoured, the widows put it through a wire sieve, and the Hermit observed that he had a great objection to the use of tannies or horse-hair sieves, when it was possible to avoid it.

We hope that any young wife with her single-handed maid-servant will profit by this instruction, and have her "stock" ready for use.

Perhaps young housewives are ignorant that it is more economical to make two apple-tarts, than one, at a time; but Lady Llanover, speaking in the person of her anchorite, assures us of this:—

The Hermit informed him his Welsh widows always made two tarts at a time, as waste was an abomination to him, and they could not divide the yolk and white of an egg with any advantage.

"Each tart," said he, "only requires half a yoke and half a white, consequently I have two tarts at a time, as the tarts will keep till I can eat them, but not the divided egg."

The Traveller really thought his venerable host had lost his memory; but he had ocular demonstration on another day, when he saw the widows make tarts, that he had not exaggerated in the least degree, and that the excellent tarts he tasted were really composed of nothing more than one ounce of fresh butter rubbed in flour, one yoke of an egg, mixed in skim milk, to wet the flour, the white of the egg being used for glazing the top of the crust, with a little white sugar; which ingredients made paste enough for two tarts, each large enough for five or six persons.

Probably people of 300*l.* a-year occasionally indulge in stewed beef. In order that they may not injure their stomachs by this indulgence, we quote for their benefit the following recipe of their guide, philosopher, and friend:—

The following day's dinner was the long-promised stewed beef, which, it will be remembered, weighed six pounds; it had stewed slowly for some

* Good Cookery from the Recipes of the Hermit of St. Gover. By the Right Hon. Lady Llanover. London: Richard Bentley. 1867.

hours; the quantity of water put in was a pint and a half; the quantity of liquid stock taken out was nearly three pints!

The meat was put on in the inner saucepan; it was gently warmed with a portion of its own stock, and on the beef the widows put all the remaining fat, which had been taken off the stock when cold, and produced by the original stewing.

In another saucepan, the widows prepared a sauce with a portion of the same jelly stock of the beef, flavouring it in a similar manner to the sauce he had made for the hashed mutton, with the exception of putting a larger proportion of carrots in the preparation of the chopped vegetables. He also had carrots and turnips cut into small balls, and put them to stew in broth, in a separate double saucepan.

The beef, when thoroughly warmed through (which process required about two hours), was served with the sauce made as described, into which the balls of carrots and turnips, which were tender and fully done, were removed before it was poured over the beef, which, having been taken out of the stock in which it was warmed, was not in the least greasy, although it had a flavour and richness derived from its own unadulterated fat, which had slowly filtered through it in the process of warming.

"Some persons," said the Hermit, "would place a thick slice of fat bacon on the top of this beef, during the process of warming; but I am a great enemy to marring the flavour of one good thing by the addition of another, which is not required. I have often known a good dish spoiled by the addition of a quantity of rusty or very salt ham or bacon, which was intended to improve its flavour. The only thing I ever use, except what you have seen (viz. its own fat), is a slice of moderately salted boiled pork, laid on the top of the beef when warming."

The Traveller declared he was so well satisfied with his dish, that he did not desire the slightest alteration or addition.

We hope that our young housekeepers will attend to the due provision of "stock," and the proper quantity of single and double saucepans; both of them appurtenances with which people of small incomes are sure to be well provided.

Let it should be imagined that Lady Llanover is amusing herself at the expense of her poorer readers, we give her useful recipe for soup for the poor:—

Sheep's-head Broth.—Two sheep's-heads, weighing five pounds and a quarter. Put in double with a quart and three quarters of a pint of water, two ounces of onions, three ounces of celery, four ounces of leeks, four ounces of turnips, three ounces of carrots, and a bunch of sweet herbs, all chopped small, stewed slowly for five hours. Broth produced three pints and a quarter. The meat taken off the bones after boiling weighed one pound and a half, and the bones two pounds. The bones were then broken small and put into the digester with two pints of water, stewed for five hours. Jelly produced, one pint. The bones were then re-broken, and stewed with one pint of water for two hours and a half; jelly produced, three-quarters of a pint. Total of good broth produced from two sheep's-heads, two quarts and one pint, to which the meat was added cut up in mouthfuls, and put in at last.

"The Hermit's Rock Cakes" have a sylvan and cavernous sound, suggesting pictures of frugal meals beneath "antres vast" and umbrageous woods. But we would remind any romantic couple who are thinking of breaking their first connubial fast amidst the sylvan solitudes of Wales on this eremitish fare, that its composition requires four ounces of fresh butter, six ounces of fine sugar, six yolks of eggs, and one pound of flour; that the butter must be beaten to a cream with the addition of four whites of eggs and currants "well plumped"—whatever that may mean. The *nota bene* which follows will be regarded, according to the taste of the readers, as a dissuasive or an encouragement. "N.B. Two persons are required to beat these cakes by turns for an hour." Strephon and Chloe beating eggs for rock cakes would form a pretty subject for our modern artists.

That Lady Llanover shows us how to cook good dishes we do not deny. The only defect is that the lessons are only of use for people who have incomes of 1,000*l.* a year and upwards. It is not Lady Llanover's fault that the material of good dishes cannot be bought for what poor people can afford to pay. Good mutton, fat fowls, fat and succulent beef—to say nothing of eggs, potatoes, onions, carrots, celery, parsnips, and all the other little contributory garnishings which enter into her recipes—are beyond the means of nineteen families out of twenty. Yet these are the dishes which combine the most nourishment with the most flavour. The result is that nineteen-twentieths of the population are living on food which is deficient both in nourishment and flavour. That the majority of these, being compelled to work out-of-doors, imbibe a degree of nourishment and strength from the open air, such as no amount of in-door eating could supply, is a fact which illustrates the compensatory goodness of Providence to man. But it is simply awful to think of the torture to which a certain number of us, whose work lies in sedentary occupations, are subjected by the mutual reaction of close air and ill-cooked hunches of meat. The elaborate cuisine of Lady Llanover, with its manifold pans and vessels, is simply an impossibility to such people. It is too high a state of *luxure* for them to aspire to. What people of this degree—people, in fact, in the broad strata of the middle class—require is a cookery which will give them, from their own simple materials, wholesome and digestible dinners. But the cooks whom they engage cannot do anything of the sort. They can neither roast, boil, stew, nor broil well. Consequently their unhappy masters and mistresses daily sit down to meals which satisfy appetite at the cost of health and digestion. If these misnamed cooks could be taught to boil and roast better, it would be a prodigious gain to the health and temper of the community. We believe that the ill effects of our present bad cookery are much under-stated. Half of the fanaticism and intolerance of that section of the middle classes which calls itself "the religious world" is, we are persuaded, due to the savage cookery by which its melancholy life is sustained. Did it eat lighter and more digestible food, it would indulge in less intolerant and ferocious sentiments. And we are convinced that bad cookery has sent more men to lunatic asylums than either love or the commercial disasters of 1866. The only

remedy is to teach cooks, as people are taught other things. Cookery, if not a science, is an art. It no more comes by nature than reading and writing do. But people don't think of training cooks, though they train ballet-girls, sempstresses, and bonnet-makers. A good *Charlotte Russe* is a higher effort of talent than a bonnet. It is less easy to set a thoroughly good roast leg of mutton on a table than to compose a piece of useless crochet. Women who are ambitious of high wages take lessons from professed cooks. But they are a small class, and only to be found in rich families. The generality of young girls intended for service know as little of the elements of cookery nowadays as they do of sewing. They are equally inept at boiling a potato and making a shirt. Consequently there is, in proportion, a much greater waste in a poor family than in a rich family, simply through the ignorance and incapacity of the servants. They are taught nothing useful thoroughly. Of course the patrons and patronesses of village schools could do much to reform this, if they chose. However, they seem indifferent to the ignorance and waste which this want of instruction generates. In our opinion, no industrial school is complete in which the girls are not taught how to make simple broths and boil vegetables in the most appetizing way. Why the poor parish girls should not receive such instruction we do not understand. It would make them not only better servants in middle-class families, but better wives for working-men. As it is, there is no waste like the waste in the house of an average English mechanic. Many of the wives of well-to-do Australian colonists were once servants in English kitchens; and to this fact is due perhaps the unsurpassedly bad cookery which has introduced dyspepsia and dysentery into the homes of Sydney and Melbourne.

If Lady Llanover, or any other person, would indite a book of simple recipes such as would be within the capacity of people who have to live and educate children on 400*l.* a year, and if any other lady or ladies would undertake to see that these instructions formed a part of female education in all poor girls' schools in the country, we believe that an inestimable boon would be conferred on four-fifths of the English nation. Nor would it be an unreasonable extension of energy if with instruction in cookery they contrived to combine instruction in that plain sewing which, in less refined days, was considered an indispensable accomplishment for the honest and industrious daughters of the poor.

CURIOSITIES OF CLOCKS AND WATCHES.*

THE history or archaeology of clocks and watches has clearly been taken up by Mr. E. J. Wood as a labour of love, and he has lavished upon it a large amount of industry, carried over a wide and multifarious range of reading. Writing as an antiquary rather than as a man of science, it is not his ambition to put forth a philosophical treatise upon the subject of chronometry in general. Nor does he pretend to analyse or explain in full the various mechanical principles on which instruments for marking time have been constructed. His object being to put before the general reader a collection of the leading curiosities, anecdotes, and oddities connected with that most ingenious of the arts, he has felt himself only concerned with technical details of clock and watch work so far as those marvellous combinations of mechanism may be regarded as forming part of such curiosities themselves. From the nature of the work, the arrangement of his materials could hardly be other than slight and desultory. There is only an approximate attempt at chronological or other method. And the style of description may be thought to fall at times too nearly into that of a house-agent's inventory or a museum catalogue. Yet, with all its slightness and occasional inconsequence, the work will be found well worth reading by all those who are interested in the subject of horology, and who, for the sake of knowledge copiously and carefully supplied, can put up with it in the shape of anecdotes, jottings, and similar odds and ends of literature.

Wisely enough, Mr. Wood does not linger over the metaphysics of his subject further than to let us know that we are not to expect from him a dogmatic definition of time. After burning his fingers with a few tentative quotations of sages and savans, from Aristotle to Laplace, he is content to let philosophy drop, and falls back upon sentiment. "Poetically speaking, we may call time the life of nature." His real object, however, is not to tell us what time is, but what has been done by mankind from the earliest period for the measurement and registration of time. Unhappily, the records and monuments of the most primitive races known to us yield but little information upon this point. Though the gnomon, or sun-dial, certainly seems to have been in use among the Egyptians, we are not aware of any example of the kind having been met with in that country. By Herodotus the invention is attributed to the Babylonians. The earliest actual notice of it we possess is the well-known one of the sun-dial of Ahaz. Its introduction into Greece is generally attributed to Anaximander. The dial, γνῶμων, was probably, in its origin, no more than an upright pillar or staff, the hours being measured by its shadow, which was marked off into feet along the ground where the shadow fell. It was, of course, extremely imperfect as an indicator of time; and it was impossible by it to divide the day into twelve equal spaces. The πόλος or ἡλιοτρόπιον, of which our museums contain several, was of a more scientific construction.

* *Curiosities of Clocks and Watches from the Earliest Times.* By Edward J. Wood. London: R. Bentley. 1866.

It consisted of a basin (*λεκανίς*) of stone or marble, in the middle of which the staff or index (*γνώμων*) was erected, throwing its shadow upon six or twelve meridian lines drawn from it as a centre to the circumference of the concave surface. The general name for instruments, of whatever kind, for measuring time was *ωρολόγιον* (*horologium*), whether it referred to a sun-dial, clepsydra, sand-glass, or clock. The period of the first introduction of the clepsydra is not known, but these contrivances are said to have been common in Egypt before they are met with in Greece. Mr. Wood has missed the fact that Plato made himself a night-clock of that sort, and that Bato, the comic writer, a century later, speaks of them as in common use, according to Athenæus. The clepsydra was used in the courts of justice at Athens to measure the time allowed for speaking, as we learn from the amusing passages in Aristophanes, as well as from allusions by the orators. Its form and construction may be seen very clearly from a passage in the *Problems* of Aristotle. A great improvement was introduced in the *ωρολόγιον ὑδραυλικόν* of Ctesibius of Alexandria about B.C. 150, which is elaborately described by Vitruvius. It combined wheel-work with the action of water, and the hours were pointed out by a small statue holding a wand. The so-called Temple of the Winds at Athens, besides exhibiting a dial, appears to have been a clepsydra on a large scale. The first *horologium* in use at Rome was a sun-dial, *solarium*, set up, according to some, by Papirius Cursor, B.C. 292; according to others, by M. Valerius Messala, from the booty of Catana, B.C. 263. This was made of a different meridian, and showed time very incorrectly. The first dial regulated to the meridian of Rome was set up by Q. Marcius Philippus. P. Scipio Nasica in his censorship, B.C. 159, established the first public clepsydra. Water-clocks were in general use in Cæsar's time for measuring the night-watches, and by a law of Cn. Pompeius, B.C. 52, they were introduced into the courts of Rome, as at Athens, as a check upon the speakers. A kind of water-clock was found in use in Britain by Cæsar, and there is good presumption, from the arithmetical treatise of one Bhaskara Acharya written in the twelfth century, that they were early used in India. A wondrous account is given by Abbot Eginhart, an eyewitness, of the timepiece sent by Abdalla, King of Persia in A.D. 810, or by the Caliph Haroun al-Raschid in 807 to the Emperor Charlemagne.

The sand-glass, in which sand took the place of water, was a modification of the clepsydra. These time-keepers were called *clepsamnia*. They were in use before the time of Jerome, A.D. 331-420. The candle-clocks of Alfred are well known. Martinelli of Spoleto, in a curious work, 1663, speaks of clocks going by earth, air, fire, and water. In the fire-clock the motion was produced upon the principle of a modern smoke-jack, the wheels being moved by means of a lamp, which also gave light to the dial, the hours being given out by the explosion of crackers set at proper intervals. In the air-clock the hours were measured by the descent of a weight expelling the air through an orifice in a tube, and giving motion to wheel-work. In 1669 the Grand Duke Cosmo was astonished to see, at the Royal Society's rooms in London, a clock the movements of which were derived from the vicinity of a loadstone. This was the earliest precursor of the modern electrical clock. It seems impossible to fix the date when clocks with wheels and weights were first invented. Boethius is said to have made one in the year 510 A.D. Pope Paul I. is reported to have sent a wheel-clock to King Pepin in 756. We are told that the Arabians first made clocks to strike in 801. Rabanus Maurus is said to have sent a clock with a bell to a friend about the year 840. The honour of inventing a wheel-clock is also given to Pacificus, Archdeacon of Vienna, who died in the middle of the ninth century. Gerbert of Fleury, afterwards Pope Sylvester II., has credit for a similar invention about the year 1000. It is not clear whether the allusion of Dante is to a mechanical clock or to a sun-dial, or whether the *orologium insigne*, given to Sherborne Abbey by William the Sacrist, in the twelfth century, was of either nature. St. Paul's Cathedral, as evidenced by the *computus bracerii* for A.D. 1286, had its *orologarius* or clock-keeper, and an agreement for altering and completing the wheel-work of the clock is extant in Norman French, dated Nov. 22, 1344, between the Dean and Chapter and Walter the "Orgoner" of Southwark. The great Clock-house at Westminster was set up by Edward I. in 1288-9, out of a fine of seven thousand marks for corruption and malpractice levied upon Sir Ralph de Hengham, Chief Justice of the King's Bench. Another clock-tower was erected there by Edward III. in 1365-6. As we get upon more historical ground, Mr. Wood's notices multiply with a profusion and a minuteness which defy selection. There is hardly a timepiece of any note, either for mechanical ingenuity or artistic excellence, that he has failed to enumerate and to describe. The great clock at Strasburg, a woodcut of which forms the frontispiece, with its imitation at Ratibon, the experiments of Charles V., the marvels of Italian, French, and Dutch taste, those of Nuremberg, Venice, and Prague, the discovery of the pendulum, the attempts at perpetual motion, the idea of a longitude-clock, notices of the most famous makers, the symbolical functions held by the clock in the imagery of poets, divines, and moralists—these are but a few samples taken at random from the mass of curious lore which the writer has to offer for the entertainment of his readers.

The second branch of the inquiry has to do with the history of watches, or portable timepieces. The origin of the watch, though not readily to be assigned to any particular date, is certainly not of the same antiquity as that of the fixed or stationary clock.

The first step towards it was obviously the invention of a coiled spring, as the motive power, instead of a weight and pendulum. And this appears to have been made during the last quarter of the fifteenth century. Nuremberg has generally had the credit of the earliest "pocket-clocks"—Nuremberg eggs, as they were called from their oval shape. The same honour has been claimed by Blois, upon less plausible grounds. Even China is said to have introduced the invention into Germany, whence it passed into France, and so into England. Peter Hele of Nuremberg, who died in 1540, as early as 1490 made small watches of steel, which pointed out and struck the hours, and might be worn on the person. By the year 1500 the manufacture was so far improved as to describe seconds of time, at which period such watches were used for astronomical purposes by George Purbach, a mathematician of Vienna. In 1544 the guild of Master Clockmakers in Paris secured from Francis I. the exclusive privilege of making clocks and watches, both large and small. Our own Clockmakers' Company was incorporated by charter of Charles I. 1631.

The performance of these early specimens of the watchmaker's art was, we may suppose, very imperfect. About the year 1650 metallic chains were commonly substituted for the catgut cord previously in general use. A great improvement was introduced in the year 1658 by the invention of the spiral or pendulum spring applied to the arbor of the balance. The first idea of this spring is attributed to the ingenious mathematician, Dr. Hooke. It was thoroughly carried out in 1665, under his directions, by the celebrated watchmaker Thomas Tompion. A watch of that kind made for Charles II. bears that date, together with the names of both inventor and constructor. A rival claim to the invention was indeed set up by Huyghens, and also by a Frenchman, Jean Hauteville, who was born at Orleans in 1647, and died in 1724. But the priority seems fairly to rest with our own country, as does also the addition of the minute hand; for, until nearly the close of the seventeenth century, watches had only one hand—namely, that which pointed to the hours. This improvement is said to have been made by Daniel Quare, a Quaker, and a famous clockmaker of that period. Many old watches were then altered to receive the spiral springs, with the additional hand, and other improvements. The first repeater was made by Quare in 1676. In 1680 Clement, a Londoner, invented the anchor-escapement, and in 1695 Tompion gave the idea of the cylinder escapement, which plan was not, however, brought into use till the following century. To Brequet is due the touch watch, or *montre de touche*, for night use or for the blind. To Nicolas Faccio, of Duiller, who was born at Geneva or Basle, February 16, 1664, belongs the merit of having first applied the art of piercing rubies to receive the pivots of the balance-wheel about the year 1700. Faccio was a clever inventor and a good scholar, who got himself into the pillory by dabbling in the quackeries and sham prophecies set on foot by a clique of Frenchmen about that time. The horizontal escapement was invented in 1724 by Tompion's apprentice, Graham, to whom we are also indebted for the mercurial compensation pendulum and the dead-beat escapement, two of the most valuable improvements ever made in clocks. The lever is only the application of Graham's dead-beat escapement to a watch. The inventions of Graham and Harrison gave to English watches a pre-eminence over those of every other country, and led to many spurious imitations abroad. One of the most singular freaks of the art was the hiliptian repeater no bigger than a silver twopenny piece, set in a ring, presented to George III. in 1764 by the celebrated Arnold, of Devereux Court, Strand. A curious watch was made for Louis XV. by Cousson junior, of Paris, in 1764, in which a simple spring was substituted for the barrel, the main-spring, the chain, and the fusee. It required no winding, but was set in motion for twenty-four hours by the simple push of a knob, like the striking spring of a repeater. About that period the foppiness of wearing two watches came into vogue, and was speedily followed by the ladies. To avoid expense, however, a dummy, or *fausse montre*, of some showy material often took the place of a real one. In Paris all sorts of whimsical toys were turned out by Julien le Roy, entitled *étranges chronométriques*; and he was even outdone in this line by J. B. Baillon, *horlogier de la reine*, who, by falling in with the luxurious and wasteful fashions of the Court, died the richest watchmaker in Europe. Mr. Wood's pages contain an ample catalogue of instances in which the skill and taste of more recent times have kept up a close rivalry with the most choice or curious specimens of the art, both at home and abroad.

The statistics of the manufacture of clocks and watches are made by Mr. Wood to yield some very noteworthy particulars. His account of the successive steps towards the determination of the longitude and the gradual perfection of the chronometer is clear and accurate, though of necessity brief and in a popular form. We have here, in particular, a chapter in the history of scientific invention which must always retain an interest for British readers. From the first offer by Philip III. in 1598, of one hundred thousand crowns for the discovery, through the tentative efforts of Hooke and Holmes, Harrison and Graham, to the ultimate precision which the problem has attained in the hands of Arnold, Earnshaw, Frodsham, and later scientific artists, there is scarcely a name, if we except Huyghens, upon that roll of honour to take aught from the exclusive meed of merit which attaches to British enterprise and skill. Here, too, while dispensing honour where honour is due, Mr. Wood seems to us no less careful of the claims of historical justice.

LAST WORDS OF EMINENT PERSONS.*

THE compiler of this curious and interesting collection judiciously states at the outset that his work is intended to serve no sect and to prove no theory. No contrast is drawn or suggested in its pages between the last hours of sceptics or infidels and those of the undoubted professors of an orthodox faith. Its object is professedly "rather a psychological than a religious one"; which, being interpreted, appears to mean that the general reader will do himself no harm, may gain some valuable impressions, and at all events gratify an intelligent curiosity, by reading dying speeches (as reported on the best procurable authority) of some two hundred and twenty historical personages from various times and countries, arranged in strict alphabetical order. With a view to variety and chance contrast, the alphabetical arrangement is as good as any other that could have been chosen. Chatterton and Chaucer, Coke and Cobbett, Loyola and Luther, Lord Nelson and the Emperor Nero, come together as pat as if they had chosen their respective neighbourhoods with a careful eye to the chiaroscuro of historical character. And there is a supreme convenience, for any ambitious reader who may dream of perhaps ending his own career as an eminent person with a last word, in being able to calculate with some exactness the particular point in a future edition at which his own last word might be inserted, so as to frame it beforehand in ideas and language that would rather be set off by, than interfere with, its immediate neighbours in the volume. Any Smith, for instance, who wished to leave behind him a reputation for originality, would obviously steer clear of any repetition in form or substance of the sentiments of Sir Philip Sidney on the one side, or of Socrates on the other. Jones would beware of unconsciously imitating Dr. Johnson or Dr. Jortin. Robinson's task would be simpler, as it would be difficult for him at present to be burned at the stake like Bishop Ridley; while the Duke of Rochefoucauld, who stands next below, does not appear to have uttered any last words at all, as far as we can gather from the account of his deathbed given in this work. To speak seriously, the alphabetical arrangement is, after all, the best for general ease of reference, as in the case of a biographical dictionary. Chronological grouping would be unsuitable, as the essential interest of each record in turn lies in the sense of the immediate annihilation of time impending over the person who uttered the words recorded. And to parcel out the speeches into classes according to their character, as instances of tragical, serene, hopeful endings of life, and so forth, would destroy the real worth of the book, by doing for the abstract reader what each reader can do best for himself. Such a collection of dying declarations proves little in any sense beyond the individual characters of the declarants, and sometimes not even as much as that. But, however little it may prove, it suggests very powerfully; and those who can find time to read and think over its pages will have every reason to be grateful to its compiler.

One almost inevitable drawback of this kind of literature is the perpetually recurring doubt, how far the words given to us as heard from dying lips were ever spoken. There are few circumstances of life in which what is said is so impressive to a listener; but the momentary impressiveness of the scene is not equivalent to a guarantee for the accurate transmission of its details through an indefinite succession of oral reporters to the chronicler who first writes them down. The doubt which hovers over the authenticity of so many famous sayings of historical persons at critical moments of their lives is apt to hang with even more than usual cloudiness over the records of their utterances *in articulo mortis*. Even where the general drift is known, the actual expression is sometimes uncertain to the last degree. Did Pitt, for example, die saying, "How I leave my country!" or "How I love my country!"? And, whichever words he used, what was the particular thought that passed through his mind and urged him to utter them? The evidence is not clear on the first point; as to the second, we can form an approximate but uncertain notion. Did Cavour, again, say on his deathbed, or was he only represented by ingenious patriotism as saying, the words which every Italian has held to as a prophecy that was bound to fulfil itself—"State sicuri che ormai la cosa va"? And if he did say them, what did he mean by them? Were they a deliberate and lucid expression of a firm faith in the future union of Italy, or a dream mixed up with the past, like the unintelligible "tête d'armée" of the dying Napoleon? It is not because the reported saying and its usual interpretation sound natural and consistent with what we know of the great and concentrated nature of the English or the Italian statesman, that we can positively assume their historical truth. As we go further back from our own days, the doubt rapidly increases whether any particular deathbed saying handed down to us is true, or only *ben trovata*.

There is one class of eminent persons the records of whose last words bear a clearer stamp of authenticity than in ordinary cases; those, we mean, who have not retired from life and history by a natural death, but helped to make history by the public suffering of a violent one. We cannot doubt that we know accurately the last words of Charles I., and that, if we do not know those of Louis XVI., it is only because they were overpowered by the roll of Santerre's drums. The details of the deaths of Sir Thomas More, Sir Walter Raleigh, and a very different man, Simon Lord Lovat, form as natural and consistent illustrations of their respective characters as their portraits drawn by the best masters; and

the evidence of authenticity is as perfect in the one case as in the other. So, again, with the last words of the most heroic among the victims of the revolutionary guillotine, tinged as the phrases are with the peculiar lurid brilliancy of the time. We may be certain that Danton said to the executioner, "You will show my head to the people—it is worth showing," and that Madame Roland persuaded the grimly polite Sanson to behead her before her proper turn with the bitterly playful "Pshaw, you can't refuse the last request of a lady." In the same way we can realize with a certain distinctness and accuracy the deaths of Egmont and Horn, Barneveldt, Argyle, and Montrose. The block and axe which end life in the full consciousness and vigour of its functions by a sudden syncope are, so to speak, the photographic instruments which give the sharpest and truest outline of the subject on which they operate. The bullet or sword-stroke of the battle-field, and the dagger of the assassin, do their work with less publicity, in a moment of excitement on the part of the witnesses which is not led up to, as in the other case, by a long climax of stately and solemn circumstance; and the security for exact reporting is consequently slighter. Yet we believe we know with tolerable accuracy what happened in the dying moments of such men as William the Silent, Nelson, and Dundee.

Perhaps the most interesting specimens of dying utterances given by Mr. Kaines in this collection belong to the philosophers; and they are probably as authentic, and as genuine mental utterances if authentic, as any. Bentham carried his principles into practice in his dying:—

Some time before his death, when he firmly believed he was near his last hour, he said to one of his disciples who was watching over him, "I now feel that I am dying; our care must be taken to minimize the pain. Do not let any one of the servants come into the room, and keep away the youths; it will be distressing to them, and they can be of no service. Yet I must not be alone; you will remain with me, and you only, and then we shall have reduced the pain to the lowest possible amount."

Diderot, we learn from his biographer Carlyle, pointed a similar example of his own theories in the appropriate manner of his dissolution:—

He once quotes from Montaigne the following, as Skeptics' Viaticum: "I plunge stupidly, headforemost into this dumb Deep, which swallows me, and chokes me, in a moment—full of insipidity and indolence. Death, which is but a quarter of an hour's suffering, without consequence and without injury, does not require peculiar precepts." It was Diderot's allotment to die with all due "stupidity"; he was leaning on his elbows, had eaten an apricot two minutes before, and answered his wife's remonstrances with—"Mais que diable de mal veux-tu que cela me fasse?" She spoke again, and he answered not.

Hobbes, at ninety-one, on being told by his doctor that he could not recover, said "Then I shall be glad to find a hole to creep out of the world at." Hume amused a quiet humour in the invention of plausible excuses for delay that he might make to Charon, after the manner of Lucian's Dialogues of the Dead. He had no home to arrange, no daughter to provide for, no enemies on whom he wished to revenge himself; he had done everything of consequence that he had ever meant to do, and was puzzled to find himself a reasonable dilatory plea:—

Upon further consideration [said he] I thought I might say to him, "Good Charon, I have been correcting my works for a new edition; allow me a little time to see how the public receive the alterations." But Charon would answer, "When you see the effect of these, you will be for making other alterations. There will be no end for such excuses; so, my honest friend, please step into the boat." But I might still urge, "Have a little patience, good Charon; I have been endeavouring to open the eyes of the public. If I live a few years longer, I may have the satisfaction of seeing the downfall of some of the prevailing systems of superstition." But Charon would then lose all temper and decency. "You loitering rogue, that will not happen these many hundred years. Do you fancy I will grant you a lease for so long a term? Get into the boat this instant, you lazy, loitering rogue."

Paley died with a characteristic expression of cheerful equanimity while his nurses were altering his position in bed:—

On his desiring to have his position changed, and being told by his surgeon that he was in danger of dying under the attempt, he with great calmness and resignation said, "Well—try—never mind," and after some severe convulsions expired.

Even in the ashes of French authors and critics live their wonted fires. Malherbe on his deathbed reprimanded his nurse for making use of a solecism in her language; and interrupted the confessor, while representing the felicities of a future state in low and trite expressions, with—"Hold your tongue; your wretched style only makes me out of conceit with them!" In the same spirit, the Spanish artist Alonzo Cano pushed away with his dying hands an ill-carved crucifix, saying he could not bear the sight of such a wretched piece of workmanship. Boileau said to a friend who tried to cheer his last illness by reading a new popular tragedy—"Ah my friend, am I not dying in time? the Pradons, whom we laughed at in our youth, were suns in comparison with these authors." Scarron, as his acquaintances stood round his deathbed in tears, told them—"You will never cry so much for me as I have made you laugh." Our Charles II. apologized to his Court, with the last breath of his characteristic urbane frivolity, for the unconscionable time which he had spent in dying.

For a very different strain from the vanity of self-conscious mortality lingering in thought upon the little prettinesses it is about to leave, we may look in Mr. Kaines's volume at Boswell's account of the last prayers and words of Dr. Johnson, Froide's picture of the death of Thomas, Lord Cromwell, and Carlyle's of that of Oliver the Protector. We may listen to Savonarola at the stake, when the Papal emissary proclaimed him cut off from the

* *Last Words of Eminent Persons*. Compiled by Joseph Kaines. London: Routledge & Sons.

Church militant and triumphant, retorting from the middle of the flames—"Not from the Church triumphant; they cannot shut me out of that." Or we may see Chaucer, on his deathbed, singing his swan's song "in great anguish," in some of the finest and wisest stanzas of all English poetry:—

Fly from the press, and dwell with soothfastness,
Suffice unto thy good, though it be small,
For hoard hath hate, and climbing tickleness;
Praise hath envy, and weal is bleat over all;
Savour no more than thee behove shall;
Rede well thyself that other folk canst rede
And truth thee shall deliver, it is no drede.

Paine thee not each crooked to redress,
In trust of her that turneth as a ball,
Great rest standeth in little business;
Beware also to spurn against a nail,
Strive not as doth a crocke with a wall;
Doometh thyself that doonest others dede
And truth thee shall deliver, it is no drede.

That thee is sent, receive in buxomness,
The wrestling of this world asketh a fall;
Here is no home, here is but wilderness;
Forth the pilgrim, for the beast out of thy stall,
Look up on high, and thanke God of all,
Waive thy lusts, and let thy ghost thee lead
And truth thee shall deliver, it is no drede.

COMING WONDERS.*

WE are glad to be able to lay before our readers an authentic account of the events which are about to take place within the next few years. Our authority is a little book by a Mr. Baxter, of which not the least attractive part consists of certain striking illustrations. There is the Emperor Louis Napoleon, whose well-known features have been rendered more mysterious and terrible by a wink which the artist has judiciously communicated to his right eye, whilst his hand rests upon a scroll inscribed "Universal Empire." Next to him comes a goat in a state of extreme excitement, fully justified by the singular disease from which it appears to be suffering. The beast's four horns are inscribed "Thrace, Syria, Egypt, and Greece." The third has suddenly shot out to a prodigious length, and has the name "Napoleon" inscribed upon it. We do not wonder that the animal's eyes are rolling wildly, and that he is obviously meditating a plunge off a small platform into infinite space. A third picture represents a leopard, apparently crossing the British Channel and just coming ashore. From each side of his head grow out three subsidiary heads, and from its crown there rise ten horns. The horns represent the ten kingdoms of Britain, France, Spain, Italy, Algeria, Tripoli, Egypt, Greece, Turkey, Syria; while across the beast's forehead are engraved the words "Napoleon Headship." We do not describe certain other pictures, which are scarcely so well calculated to thrill the public bosom, but will at once reveal the mysteries which these symbols darkly embody. As may be imagined by those versed in Apocalyptic literature, Napoleon III. is the Beast; his number is 666, and his name is evidently "radically the same as Apollyon." The series of events which will take place under his guidance has been frequently sketched. The first thing he will do is to make a covenant with certain Jews for a space of seven years, in pursuance of which they will be re-established in the Holy Land, and recommence the ancient sacrifices. He will then by some means become absolute head of the ten nations whose names we have mentioned. The results will be singularly disagreeable. Napoleon, with the help of the Pope, will insist upon his worship being established throughout Europe. No one will be allowed to buy or sell unless he has the figures 666 stamped upon his forehead. Those who resist will be exposed to a persecution of the most frightful description. The only means by which Mr. Baxter succeeds in conveying some faint idea of the approaching times is by a quotation from Sir Archibald Alison, describing the bloodshed in the Reign of Terror. Such scenes will be repeated all over England and America, which last country we are informed (though it does not appear on what ground the calculation is based) contains about half the number of actually existing saints. Not only will the guillotine be erected, but the powers of evil will have supernatural assistance. The Pope will become possessed of mimulous power, although he will only be able to exercise it in the presence of Napoleon. This, as if miraculous power were not enough to account for anything, is explained by a kind of "magical mesmeric influence" attaching to the Emperor. But Napoleon is to have still more terrible allies in the shape of scorpion-locusts. "Their supernatural character"—that of the locusts that are to come out of the smoke of the bottomless pit—"is sufficiently evidenced by the fact that they are sedulously to avoid killing a single individual, or injuring the trees or grass or any green thing." So far the locusts from the bottomless pit seem to be of a more agreeable breed than those which we raise upon earth; however, they will go about stinging in a very unpleasant fashion; and we fully admit that their personal appearance will be against them. They are to look like "an unnatural hybrid compound of varied features of six different beings—locusts, horses, men, women, lions, scorpions"—which we also fully admit to be "a monstrous combination, calculated to strike terror into the hearts of all whom they attack." There is a still more unpleasant kind of demon, the description of which proves

them, as Mr. Baxter mildly observes, to be "preternatural un-earthly monsters. The heads of the horses are like lions' heads, which is not at all the case with ordinary horses; and 'out of their mouths issued fire and smoke and brimstone;' these can only be understood in connexion with the explanation that they are infernal animals coming up out of the previously opened bottomless pit; their tails also are not composed of common horse-hair, but are like a serpent, and terminate in a serpent's head, armed with teeth and fangs, with which people are bitten and injured." The logical force with which Mr. Baxter infers the supernatural character of these animals from their personal peculiarities, when they might have been identified by superficial observers with a mere variety of the ordinary horse, is truly admirable. Supported by such demons, we do not wonder at Napoleon's conquest of England and the United States. Even if our army were not composed, to at "least one-third of its numbers, of Fenians," we might be unable to resist. We are glad, however, to observe that Russia and Prussia will partially escape; they will indeed acknowledge Napoleon as in some sense their head, "although perhaps the worship of Napoleon's image may be less rigorously enforced throughout them than within the Roman earth"—which is gratifying for Count Bismark. During these events, Napoleon, whose treachery is well known, will have quarrelled with the Jews, and, in combination with all the other nations of the world, will direct an expedition against Jerusalem. The English and American merchants will raise a feeble objection, but they will naturally not be of much account. The Euphrates will be dried up in order to allow the Jews from all parts of the world to come to the rescue; and the necessity of this miracle is strikingly proved by the fact that on one occasion Para, King of Armenia, had great difficulty in passing the river without ships, not being able to find a ford. Then will come the battle of Armageddon, with a catastrophe which we need not particularly describe; and the Pope and Louis Napoleon will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, to the general satisfaction of the saints. We are glad, however, to say that some of the wicked will be converted before this event. Mr. Baxter condescends to inform us that they will not have "showers of fire and brimstone instantly poured out upon them, as ill-informed persons have incorrectly asserted." Considering the evident minuteness and accuracy of Mr. Baxter's own information, this statement cannot but be gratifying.

This is all, it may be said, mere imbecile raving, of which it is scarcely worth while even to make a jest. And yet there are some points of view which are not altogether uninteresting. We are informed that this is a second edition; that there are cheaper tracts in which the same views are disseminated; and that the "author has received many applications from ministers in the Southern States of America for a gratuitous supply of copies of his books." And there is something in the book which enables us to believe that, in certain classes of society, it may really be tolerably effective. There are two or three successful shots which help it to the same sort of interest as Zadkiel's almanac. Thus the author says that he stated in 1865 "that the Austrian Empire would be broken up and Venetia re-annexed to Italy." It is true that he makes equally absurd blunders; thus he says that the Austrian Empire will be "rent in two" along the line of the Danube, and he denies that the French troops will ever go out of Mexico. But these trifling aberrations will not injure the irresistible argument drawn from a single lucky coincidence; for, as we know, there is always a way of accounting for any slip, if indeed people are critical enough to observe one. Nor is it merely as a rival to Zadkiel that Mr. Baxter has a chance of success. This is indeed not a trifling advantage. The saints like a little excitement more or less mimicking the amusements of the wicked, though of course sanctified by a totally different application. Religious papers intended for popular circulation generally contain Scriptural puzzles, or Biblical charades, or double acrostics, in which you are requested to remember the name of the priest who met a celebrated warrior returning from battle, and the river whose name occurs in connexion with the greatest prophet of Israel. To treat the whole future history of the world as the solution of a gigantic conundrum falls in exactly with the spirit encouraged by these holy games; and it is doubtless as exciting to speculate upon the persons typified by the three frogs, and to find a new application for 666, as to talk about the winner of the next year's Derby. There is no money to be won in the former case, but that is made up by the greater intrinsic interest of the event. The great reliance, however, of Mr. Baxter and his like is upon something more profound than this spirit of holy curiosity. The real purpose of the book appears in the passages with which the prophetic speculation is liberally interspersed. Mr. Baxter is always going off unexpectedly into the true camp-meeting rant. He breaks out into such passages as this:—"Awful day! awful coming! awful Lord! awful suddenness! awful judgment! 'Prepare to meet your God'—prepare to meet His day—prepare to meet His judgments—prepare—prepare!" Or we meet apostrophes beginning, "You who are theatre-goers, gamblers, lovers of field-sport, frequenters of fashionable parties, ball-rooms, and concerts, revelling in luxury, clothed in purple and fine linen, faring sumptuously every day, novel-readers, or, perchance, ardent lovers of the sciences and arts, poetry, painting, and music"—you will, to put it shortly, be tortured by the scorpion-locusts, or "cast into the red-hot caverns of the bottomless pit, from which at times there issues a dark smoke—awfully indicative of the tremendous heat which the unpardoned will have to suffer." It is in this appeal to grossly material horrors which

* *Coming Wonders, expected between 1867 and 1875.* By the Rev. M. Baxter. London: S. W. Partridge.

is the real essence of the book; it is the old attempt to enforce religion by gloating over fire and brimstone and devils and scorpions and all the machinery of torture. The firm belief that before 1875 all the wicked—that is, every one who does not agree with you—will be exposed to these torments, is a highly exhilarating stimulant. In old Roman Catholic countries the craving for a similar excitement is satisfied by the pictures of purgatory and hell-fire which are so much affected by the peasantry. This reading supplies to Protestant communities the same sort of satisfaction, made even more exciting by the expectation of an immediate approach of the events predicted. But the eloquence is a good deal spoilt by being served up cold. To appreciate it thoroughly, we ought to hear the screams of the orator to the excited crowd of an American camp-meeting or an English revival; but, for those who have never listened to such eloquence, this sample may be better than nothing.

Of its religious value we need not speak. Those who simply laugh at it as an amusing exhibition of intellectual imbecility may usefully draw one moral. Mr. Baxter is certainly ignorant and absurd enough, but the blunder which he makes is not entirely peculiar to him and his like. His fundamental error may be said to be that of the cheese-mite who should regard the universe entirely in its relation to his particular cheese. Mr. Baxter really believes that all this supernatural machinery is to be put in motion to encourage the creed to which he belongs; that the world has all been arranged with a view to one narrow series of events, and that the explanation has been put into his hands in the shape of a puzzling enigma. No argument could exhibit to Mr. Baxter the full absurdity of this; but he is not the only man who, on a greater or smaller scale, is exposed to a similar delusion.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

MONDAY POPULAR CONCERTS, St. James's Hall.—LAST MORNING PERFORMANCES OF THE SEASON on Saturdays, March 16, 23, and 30.—On Saturday, 16th, the Programme will include Beethoven's celebrated Septet; Mendelssohn's Trio in C minor; Bach's Prelude, Sarabande, and Gavotte, for Violoncello; and Solo by Chopin, for Pianoforte. Executants: Madame Schumann, M.M. Strauss, Zerbini, Reynolds Lazarus, C. Harper, Winterbottom, and Platt. Sofa Stalls, 5s.; Balcony, 3s.; Admission, 1s.—Programmes and Tickets at Chapell & Co.'s, 30 New Bond Street.—THE LAST EVENING CONCERTS, March 11, 18, 25, and April 1.

PHILHARMONIC SOCIETY.—FIRST CONCERT, March 11th.—Queen's Concert Rooms, Hanover Square. Conductor, Mr. W. G. Cusins. Solists: Herr Joachim, Miss Louisa Pyne, and Mr. W. H. Cummings. Subscription, Four Guineas; Family ditto, Three and a Half Guineas; Single Tickets, 18s. At 1s. each, Addison & Co.'s, 63 New Bond Street.

By Order, STANLEY LUCAS, Secretary.

MR. HENRY LESLIE'S CONCERT, March 13, St. James's Hall.—Mendelssohn's ANTIGONE repeated, and Selections from Cherubini, Mozart, Beethoven, Weber, Spohr, and Gounod. Pianoforte, Mr. Charles Hallé. Full Orchestra and Chorus of 240 Voices.—Tickets, 10s. 6d., 5s., 2s. 6d., and 1s.

MUSICAL UNION.—The RECORD of 1866, with a View of the Description of the Tomb of Beethoven, is this day sent to Members with their Tickets. New Talent is engaged for the present Season. Subscriptions paid to Anderson & Fanny, or by Cheque to J. ELLA, 18 Hanover Square.

ART-UNION OF LONDON.—Subscription, One Guinea.—Prizeholders select from the Public Exhibitions. Every Subscriber has a chance of a valuable Prize, and in addition receives an impression of an interesting and important Plate. "PITY," engraved by H. Lemon, from the Original Picture by H. Le Jeune, A.R.A. Now ready for delivery.

444 West Strand, W.
February 1867.

GEORGE GODWIN, Hon. Sec.
LEWIS FOCOCK, J. Hon. Sec.

SOCIETY OF PAINTERS IN WATER-COLOURS.—The WINTER EXHIBITION OF SKETCHES AND STUDIES IS NOW OPEN, 5 Pall Mall East. Ten till Six.—Admission, 1s. WILLIAM CALLOW, Secretary.

INSTITUTE OF PAINTERS IN WATER-COLOURS.—Will close next week their EXHIBITION OF SKETCHES AND STUDIES. Gallery, 53 Pall Mall, opposite Marlborough House. Daily, from Nine till Dusk.—Admission, 1s.; Catalogue, 6d. JAS. FAHEY, Secretary.

INSTITUTION OF NAVAL ARCHITECTS.—NOTICE.—THE EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INSTITUTION OF NAVAL ARCHITECTS will take place at Twelve o'clock, on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, the 11th, 12th, and 13th of April next, at the Hall of the Society of Arts, John Street, Adelphi, London. There will also be EVENING MEETINGS on Thursday and Friday, at Seven o'clock.

Papers on the Principles of Naval Construction, on Practical Shipbuilding, on Steam Navigation, on the Equipment and Management of Ships for Merchandise and for War, will be read at this Meeting. Naval Architects, Shipbuilders, Naval Officers of the Royal and Merchant Services, and Engineers who propose to read Papers before the Institution, are requested immediately to send in their Papers, with illustrative Drawings, to the Secretary. Candidates for admission as Members or as Associates are requested to send in their Applications immediately. The Annual Subscription of £3 2s. is payable on admission, and becomes due at the commencement of each succeeding year.

*A Volume VII. of the "TRANSACTIONS," containing a Nominal and General Index to the Seven Volumes, is now complete, and in course of delivery to the Members and Associates.

CHARLES CAMPBELL, Assistant-Secretary.

MARLBOROUGH COLLEGE, 1867.—There will be an ELECTION in June next, to EIGHT SCHOLARSHIPS, viz.: TWO SENIOR SCHOLARSHIPS of the value of £50 a year each.

A "BERENS" and an "IRELAND" SCHOLARSHIP of the annual value of £17 and £14 respectively.

These Four Scholarships are tenable as long as the holders shall continue members of the College.

Candidates must have been under Fifteen Years of Age on January 1, 1867.

Also, FOUR JUNIOR SCHOLARSHIPS tenable for Two Years, of the value of £20 each.

The age of Candidates must have been under Fifteen on January 1, 1867.

The "IRELAND" is limited to Sons of Clergymen, the rest entirely open.

In the case of a successful Candidate not being a member of the College, a Free Nomination worth £20 will be given.

Further particulars will be supplied on application to Mr. W. P. SELLICK, the College, Marlborough.

CHELTHAM COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS.—TWO

SCHOLARSHIPS (each of the annual value of £70) will be open to Competition on April 25, 1867, to all Boys who were under the age of Fifteen on January 1, 1867.

All particulars to be had by application to the SECRETARY, at the College.

Candidates' Names must be sent in not later than April 10.

BRADFIELD.—ST. ANDREW'S COLLEGE, Bradfield,

near Reading.—Incorporated by Royal Charter. One Exhibition of £30 and one of £25

will be open in April next to Candidates for admission to this School. For information, apply to the Warden, Rev. THOMAS STUBBS, Bradfield, near Reading; or to the Honorary Secretary, J. H. PATTERSON, Esq., at his Chambers, 1 Elm Court, Middle Temple, London.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.—NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that on Wednesday, the 24th of April next, the Senate will proceed to Elect EXAMINERS in the following Departments:

Examinerships.	Salaries. (Each.)	Present Examiners.
ARTS AND SCIENCES.		
Two in Classics	£200	Dr. William Smith.
Two in The English Language, Literature, and History	£120	Rev. Joseph Angus, D.D.
Two in The French Language	£50	Chr. Knight Wilson, Esq., M.A.
Two in The German Language	£50	Rev. P. H. Ernest Brett, Esq., M.A.
Two in The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, the Greek Text of the New Testament, the Evidence of the Christian Religion, and Scriptural History	£50	Theodore Karcher, Esq., LL.B.
Two in Logic and Moral Philosophy	£80	Prof. Bushelm, Ph.D.
Two in Political Economy	£50	William Aldis Wright, Esq., M.A.
Two in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy	£200	Prof. Bain, M.A.
Two in Experimental Philosophy	£100	Edward Poste, Esq., M.A.
Two in Chemistry	£175	William B. Hodgson, Esq., LL.D.
Two in Botany and Vegetable Physiology	£75	Jacob Waley, Esq., M.A.
Two in Geology and Paleontology	£75	Edward John Routh, Esq., M.A.
LAW.		
Two in Law and the Principles of Legislation	£100	Isaac Todhunter, Esq., M.A., F.R.S.
MEDICINE.		
Two in Medicine	£150	Prof. Stokes, M.A., D.C.L., Sec. R.S.
Two in Surgery	£150	Henry Debus, Esq., Ph.D., F.R.S.
Two in Anatomy	£100	Prof. Williamson, Ph.D., F.R.S.
Two in Physiology, Comparative Anatomy, and Zoology	£150	Rev. M. J. Berkeley, M.A.
Two in Midwifery	£75	Thos. Thomson, Esq., M.D., F.R.S.
Two in Materia Medica and Pharmaceutical Chemistry	£75	Archibald Geikie, Esq., F.R.S., F.G.S.
Two in Forensic Medicine	£50	Prof. T. Rupert Jones, F.G.S.

The Examiners above named are re-eligible, and intend to offer themselves for re-election. Candidates must send in their Names to the Registrar, with any attestation of their qualifications they may think desirable, on or before Tuesday, March 26. It is particularly desired by the Senate that no personal application of any kind be made to its individual Members.

Burlington, W.

By Order of the Senate,
WILLIAM B. CARPENTER, M.D., Registrar.

March 3, 1867.

MILITARY EXAMINATIONS.—CANDIDATES for Woolwich, Sandhurst, or Direct Commissions in the Army, and Officers about to enter the Staff College, prepared in all the Branches required at the Examinations, by a retired Married OFFICER, who has passed through the Senior Department at Sandhurst, seen much of the Service (Seymour) and on the Staff, and served as a Captain of Engineers in the Crimea.—Address, A. D. C., Royal United Service Institution, Whitehall, London.

NAVAL CADETS.—EASTMAN'S R.N. ACADEMY, SOUTHEAST.

At four recent Examinations, SIXTY-THREE PUPILS passed as Naval Cadets.

At the last Examination Pupils took Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, &c., Places.

Applications to be addressed to Dr. SPRICKNELL, as above.

CIVIL SERVICE HALL.—CANDIDATES for the India Civil Service, the Government Offices, and the Army are prepared for their Examinations at the Civil Service Hall, 12 Princes Square, Bayswater, W., by A. D. SFRANGE, M.A., assisted by Graduates in Honours of Oxford, Cambridge, &c.

INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE, WOOLWICH, SANDHURST, and the LINE.—Mr. WREN, M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge, assisted by a High (Fifth) Wrangler, an Oxford First-class Classic, and the best Masters obtainable for all the other Subjects allowed to be taken up, receives RESIDENT and NON-RESIDENT PUPILS. References to Parents of numerous successful Pupils. Moderate terms.—Wiltshire House, 5 John's Road, Brighton, S.

WOOLWICH, SANDHURST, and the LINE.—A GENTLEMAN, whose Pupils have been eminently successful—one passed 8th at the last Woolwich Examination—receives FOUR PUPILS to prepare for the above.—Address, W. B., 57 Post Office, Barnes, S.W.

WOOLWICH, SANDHURST, the LINE, and the UNIVERSITIES.—EIGHT PUPILS are prepared for the above by the Rev. G. B. ROBERTS, M.A., late Fellow of Cor. Christi Coll. Camb., and late Professor in the R. I. M. College, Addiscombe.—Address, The Limes, Croydon, S.

PARIS.—INSTITUTION INTERNATIONALE, Chatou, near Paris. In connexion with the London College of the International Educational Society, Limited.—Special study of French and other Modern Languages, Natural Sciences, Mathematics, Classics, and all the other branches of a Liberal Education, harmonizing with the wants and spirit of the age.—For Prospectuses apply to the Head-Master, Mr. P. BANANAS; or to the Secretary, at the Society's Office, 24 Old Bond Street, W.

TUITION.—The Rev. T. FIELD, B.D., Vicar of Pampesford, Cambridge, formerly Tutor and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge, prepares PUPILS for the University or the Competitive Examinations, and has Vacancies at present. Terms at the rate of £200 per annum.

AN INCUMBENT (Married) of a Country Parish in a Midland County, late Student of Christ Church, Ford of Tuition, and with some spare time on his hands, will be glad to receive One or Two PUPILS to prepare for the Public Schools. If desired, accommodation can be had for a Penny.—Address, M. A., Mr. J. Nash, 4 Saville Place, Regent Street.

SCHOOL of CHEMISTRY, 20 Great Marlborough Street.

Directed by Mr. VACHER.

The LABORATORIES are Open Daily from Ten to Five, for the Study of Analysis.

Terms, 2s. per Month.

Private Lessons given in the Elements of Chemistry.

COVENTRY FREE GRAMMAR SCHOOL.—A FRENCH MASTER WANTED in this School, at or before Midsummer. The Salary will be at the rate of £62 12s. per annum, payable out of certain rents, and Two-Twentieths of the Fees payable by the Boys, which Fees last year amounted to £22, the highest rate having been £2.

The time devoted to French is about Ten Hours in the week, subject to the regulations of the Head-Master.

A knowledge of the German Language will be of importance.

There is no French or German Master resident in the neighbourhood.

The appointment to be subject to removal on Six Months' Notice, to expire at Midsummer or Christmas.

Applications and Testimonials must be addressed, on or before Tuesday, April 2, 1867, under cover and sealed up, marked "Free School," to Messrs. TROSCOTT, Lea, & KIRBY, Clerks to the Trustees, Coventry.

March 1, 1867.

SECRETARY or CLERK.—A YOUNG GENTLEMAN of good Education and Address wishes for a post as above. Is worthy of confidence, will work, and has the highest references. Immediate Salary not so much an object as Employment.—Address, A., care of W. Reade, Jun., Esq., Solicitor, Kingwood, Hants.

LAW.—TO PARENTS AND GUARDIANS.—An established Firm of Solicitors, practising in a Cathedral City in the West of England, are willing to take a Young Gentleman as ARTICLED CLERK. He could reside with one of the Principals, who is a Married Man.—For further particulars, apply to Messrs. HANCOCK, SAUNDERS, & HAWKES, Solicitors, 26 Carey Street, Lincoln's Inn.

HYDROPATHIC SANATORIUM, SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill, Surrey.—Physician, Dr. EDWARD J. AINE, M.A., M.D. (Edin. Univ.).—For the treatment of Chronic Diseases, principally by the combined Natural Agents—Air, Exercise, Water, and Diet. Turkish Baths on the Premises, under Dr. Lane's Medical Direction.

WHAT WILL THIS COST TO PRINT?—An immediate Answer to the Inquiry, and a SPECIMEN BOOK of TYPES, with information for Authors, may be obtained, on application to

R. BARRETT & SONS, 13 Mark Lane, London.